```
1
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
                      EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
                     - - - - X
 3
                                     : 22-CV-00893 (LDH) (TAM)
4
     TROOPER 1,
5
               Plaintiff,
6
                                     : United States Courthouse
          -against-
                                     : Brooklyn, New York
7
                                     : September 26, 2023
8
                                     : 11:00 a.m.
     NEW YORK STATE POLICE, et
9
     al.,
10
                Defendants.
11
12
     ANDREW CUOMO,
                                     : 23-MC-1587 (LDH)(TAM)
13
                Plaintiff,
14
15
         -against-
16
                Defendants.
17
     LINDSEY BOYLAN,
18
19
                        - - - - X
20
            TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR STATUS CONFERENCE
                  BEFORE THE HONORABLE TARYN A. MERKL
21
                     UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
22
    APPEARANCES:
23
     For the Plaintiff
                           WIGDOR, LLP
24
    Trooper 1:
                                85 Fifth Avenue
                                New York, New York 10003
25
                                VALDI LICUL, ESQ.
                           BY:
                                JOHN CRAIN, ESQ.
```

ī			
			3
1			
2	For the interested EM party Kaitlin Doe:	EMERY CELLI BRINCKERHOFF & ABADY, LLP 75 Rockefeller Plaza, 20th Floor New York, New York 10019	
3	party Kaitiii boe.		
4	ВҮ	Y: ZOE SALZMAN, ESQ.	
5	For the interested EI party Charlotte	ISENBERG & SCHNELL, LLP 233 Broadway, Suite 2704	
6	Bennett:	New York, New York 10279	
7	ВҮ	Y: HERBERT EISENBERG, ESQ.	
8			
9	Court Reporter: Michele	e D. Lucchese, RPR, CRR	
10	Officia Officia	al Court Reporter dman Plaza East	
11	Brookly	yn, New York 11201 613-2272	
12		MLuccheseEDNY@gmail.com	
13	Proceedings recorded by produced by Computer-aid	computerized stenography. Transcript ded Transcription.	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
2324			
24 25			
23			
			,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.

THE COURT: Good morning, everybody. You may be seated.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: This is civil cause for a status conference, docket 22-CV-893, Trooper 1 versus New York State Police, et al., and docket 23-MC-1587, Cuomo versus Boylan.

Will the parties please state their appearances for the record, starting with the plaintiff.

MR. LICUL: Good morning, Your Honor. Valdi Licul, Wigdor, LLP for Trooper 1.

MR. CRAIN: Good morning, Your Honor. John Crain Wigdor, LLP for Trooper 1.

MS. PERRY: Danya Perry from Perry Law for nonparty Lindsey Boylan. With me is my colleague Doug Quzack from my office.

MS. GLAVIN: Good morning, Your Honor. Rita Glavin, along with my colleagues Leo Korman and Katherine Petrino. We are with Glavin, PLLC and we represent the former Governor Andrew Cuomo.

MS. TRZASKOMA: Good morning, Your Honor. Theresa Trzaskoma from Sher Tremonte, LLP, also on behalf of Governor Cuomo, and my colleague Allegra Noonan is also here. Thank you.

MS. FOTI: Good morning, Your Honor. Catherine Foti

Proceedings

from the firm Morvillo Abramowitz Grand Iason & Anello, appearing with my colleagues Joseph Stern and Kayasha Lyons. We represent Melissa DeRosa and Richard Azzopardi.

MR. PALERMO: Good morning, Your Honor. Daniel Palermo from Harris Beach, PLLC, on behalf of the New York State Police.

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning.

And it's also my understanding that we have counsel for additional interested parties present. I'm see some of them nodding. My courtroom deputy took your names. I will turning to the interested parties after I address the main parties in the case. So thank you all for being here.

As everybody knows, we are here today for a discovery conference, as all who are involved in this discovery process know, there are a number of pending motions and complex issues at stake. By last count, there were something like 25 pending motions across three dockets. It might be more, because I think some were filed on Friday and over the weekend.

Governor Cuomo, in a letter, recently characterized the discovery situation in this case as a quagmire. Sadly, that characterization is pretty close to the mark. There are many issues at stake in this discovery process that have extremely important ramifications for the integrity of our governments, the integrity of investigations conducted by the

Proceedings

State legislature, and the Attorney General's Office, and for the complainants that came forward in those investigations.

Through the civil discovery in this case, Governor Cuomo seeks a wide swath of discovery materials that were generated in the course of those official Government investigations into his conduct and in the discovery process in this case, which is brought by a single plaintiff, is this the correct forum to attempt to recreate that widespread investigation? The answer to that is no. On the current record, Governor Cuomo appears to be attempting to defend against or attack the entirety of investigation conducted by the Attorney General and the Assembly Judiciary Committee.

As I noted before, this strategy has very significant implications for the complainants in the case, many of whom are here.

Part of the problem, as I see it, rests with the plaintiff in this case. The parties and Trooper 1 and Governor Cuomo have not meaningfully met and confer in an effort to narrow what the discovery process should be in this case. They also have not, in my judgement, meaningfully met and conferred prior to filing many of the motions that have been filed in this case in direct contravention of my individual rules. This has to stop.

The record as presently developed provides no clear boundary to the information from the investigative reports

Proceedings

Trooper 1 seems to be seeking to introduce. So, first, I want to address with the parties the parameters of the anticipated proof in the Trooper 1 case because this is critical to the Court's evaluation of relevance overall and this is what has been lacking from the conversation and from the briefing.

Another thing that is notably lacking from the briefing is time-back discovery requests made by Governor Cuomo to Trooper 1 and that is the deficiency I have seen repeatedly in the defendant's papers. Many of the papers are speaking about the Attorney General's report in general without specifically tying it to this case, and that needs to stop as well.

So, first, I would like to hear from you, Mr. Licul, as to which witnesses were included in your Rule 26(a)1 statement and how do you anticipate proving your case?

MR. LICUL: Your Honor, thank you for the opportunity. We included all of the victims who are mentioned in the AG's report and in the Assembly report and that's based upon Black letter Second Circuit law that says that in a hostile work environment case, the jury must hear the entirety of the evidence, including the perpetrator's harassment of other victims. And that's the Perry case and that's the Cruz case, and we are entitled to do that.

Your Honor, I understand that that means that there are quite a number of victims here, but that is not

Proceedings

Trooper 1's one fault. That is the fault of the Governor and his conduct, and it would be wholly improper and unfair to require Trooper 1 to litigate this case with the Governor saying well, these were just petty slights and minor inconveniences when his conduct was repeated over and over and over again with other women who also took exception.

Trooper 1 is entitled to a fair trial. As is the Governor, but she's entitled to present that evidence of the other victims in this case.

And, Your Honor, discovery is not yet complete. I understand that. But what that strategy will be specifically after the litigation, I think is for another day.

I do want to mention one thing, Your Honor, about Your Honor's comment about us not narrowing. And, Your Honor, respectfully, I think that we have done everything. We are virtually complete on our end with discovery. We just need the Governor's deposition, and he refuses to be deposed.

We offered the defendants Trooper 1's deposition.

They cancelled it the day before. So it's not that Trooper 1 is hiding anything.

There is no motion before this Court by any of the defendants that Trooper 1 has not produced any documents, that she has somehow shirked her responsibilities. That's not before the court, no one has accused us of that.

And, so, Your Honor I think that -- and where we've

Proceedings

had the opportunity to discuss narrowing, in each instance -we only have three motions pending out of the 25 or so that
are here. We only have three: One is to demand that the
Governor sit for his deposition. He is a defendant. He can't
not sit for his deposition; and two, that he do that before we
inconvenience the nonparties. That's what we're asking for.

And to the extent that the Governor seeks to subpoena, you know, who someone slept with or prior sexual history or the phone records of a witness' daughter, his deposition should come first, and he should learn what Trooper 1 has to say. He cannot go directly to say -- to issuing 50 subpoenas or so. I'm using that -- it's probably close to that, but numerous subpoenas without complying with his own obligations.

At each step, we have met and conferred. We have discussed, and we have resolved, and there were issues that they had with our production. We resolved each and every one of them.

There were issues with the Governor conveniently losing his phone in the Atlantic Ocean at one point. He lost it in August of 2021 just as discovery was beginning. We didn't make a motion. We resolved the issue by trying to get the information in a different way.

So I think I have gone beyond what the Court's specific question was. But I do think that we have, in every

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

10

instance, narrowed this, tried avoid inconveniencing nonparties and tried to get the discovery here resolved. And we're prepared to resolve it by the 16th, which is the currently deadline.

THE COURT: That clearly is not going to be the end of that discovery given where we are.

But, Mr. Licul, you've represented that you've included all the complainants in the reports, in your Rule 26(a)1 disclosures on the reliance on the theory that as a hostile work environment case the instances it happened with This is not the first time we have others may come in. discussed *Perry* in the context of this litigation. been argument on the other side that her work environment, Trooper 1's work environment was different than the people who worked directly in the executive chamber. She worked for the New York State Police. She was on the PSU and it was a different situation for her than some of the other complainants who came forward. And is this something we need to resolve now in the discovery process before they seek to depose eight or ten people as to whether or not the information pertaining to these other complainants is likely to be sufficiently analogous as to overcome 404(b) and Rule 403.

MR. LICUL: I don't think so, Your Honor, because the environment is the environment around the Governor,

whether somebody works for the State police, whether a woman works for the PR department, whether she is a secretary, an administrative assistant, whether she works for some other State agency, the fact is that the environment we are talking about is some level of circular sort of geographic and sort of scope around the Governor. How did he treat women who worked around him?

The fact that somebody was there to protect him,
like Trooper 1, doesn't mean that his harassment of her is
different than his harassment of, say, somebody who works as a
briefer.

THE COURT: Mr. Licul, by that analogy, how he treats the woman around him, would the Governor then be entitled to parade in all of the women who have said they suffered no harassment to show how he treated the women around him?

MR. LICUL: I think that has limited utility, Your Honor, because the case law is clear: Just because don't harass everyone, doesn't mean you didn't harass the victim. It's the equivalent of a murder defendant saying I'd like to introduce the people that I didn't kill, right. I mean, that is not relevant in this case.

THE COURT: Well, by your theory of relevance, you're saying that the environment is the environment setting sort of a perimeter around the Governor, right. If he has

12 Proceedings 1 essential right-hand people, which he did, who are female, who 2 are not mistreated, you know, how do you overcome that Rule 3 404(b), Rule 403 analysis and say you can do it but they 4 can't? MR. LICUL: I'm not necessarily saying that, Your 5 Honor. I just don't think that's for today. 6 7 The Governor is not trying to depose people who are going to exonerate him. What he's trying to do here with 8 9 these 50 subpoenas or so is go after the people who had 10 adverse information. 11 THE COURT: Right. But by your theory of relevance, 12 you would be hard-pressed to oppose their depositions. 13 MR. LICUL: They haven't asked for any and we 14 haven't. So I guess --15 They subpoenaed many people for THE COURT: 16 deposition who were complainants in those reports. 17 MR. LICUL: No, no. I'm sorry, Your Honor. 18 have misunderstood. 19 I meant if he wanted to subpoena somebody who's 20 going to say the Governor was wonderful, he never harassed me. 21 I don't know of such subpoena. And to the extent one exists, 22 we haven't opposed. 23 THE COURT: Right. But do you opposed, based on 24 your theory of relevance, you filed a motion to quash in part

on behalf of Ms. Boylan, right?

13 Proceedings MR. LICUL: Yes. 1 2 So how do you say they can't take THE COURT: 3 discovery as to Ms. Boylan under your theory of relevance? 4 MR. LICUL: Our motion of Ms. Boylan is limited. THE COURT: It's only as to those documentary 5 6 evidence in the third-party subpoenas to --7 MR. LICUL: Right. It is the Rule 412 analysis. 8 THE COURT: So you're not objecting to the 9 depositions? That's what I'm trying to clarify. 10 MR. LICUL: We're not objecting to the depositions. 11 Obviously, we will defer to those witnesses who have 12 additional objections. But we are objecting to the deposition 13 and the document request to the extent they seek prior sexual 14 history. That's the scope. That's the extent to which we are 15 joining in those two motions. 16 But other than that, our other two motions are to 17 have the Governor be deposed and to basically have that happen 18 first before he can do nonparty discovery and make him stop 19 intimidating witnesses. I mean, there is a pretty healthy 20 record of some pretty disturbing behavior that started before 21 this case during the investigation and continues through June 22 of this year. I mean, the most recent letter by Ms. Hinton 23 alleges that Cuomo directly threatened to release dirt that 24 her children would not want out there. And I'm not saying

that she used the word dirt. That's my paraphrasing of it.

25

But that's the gist of it.

And, Your Honor, I think there is a solution to this.

Early on in this case we had an issue about what we could do or what the scope of discovery was with respect to Mr. -- as a party and Ms. DeRosa, both of whom are subject to a motion to dismiss that is still pending. And I think Your Honor had a solution, which has worked out well. They would produce to us any documents that they produced to the AG as part of the investigation, and to the extent more information was needed, we would meet and confer on specific pieces of information. That worked out well. We've completed our discovery, essentially, of those two parties in this case. The nonparties should not be treated any differently. They're sort of witnesses to the accident.

So, to the extent anyone should be burdened, it should be the parties here.

Cuomo should be deposed. And we think that it's a pest solution to this problem. I understand that many of these witnesses have, in fact, already produced to the Governor what they produced to the AG's Office. And to the extent there's something specific, the parties can meet and confer. But subpoening their phone records, husband's phone records, daughter's phone records, school records, that's well beyond the pale.

	Proceedings 15		
1	THE COURT: So you suggest a similar solution to the		
2	one that we reached, the accommodation we reached as a party		
3	undergoes, and that's proving workable based on the discovery		
4	to date?		
5	MR. LICUL: There has been no motion practice		
6	regarding that.		
7	THE COURT: That's true.		
8	MR. LICUL: So the proof is in the pudding, I		
9	suppose.		
10	But, yes, that's a perfectly sensible solution to		
11	this.		
12	THE COURT: So you would anticipate these		
13	depositions going forward as to the additional complainants?		
14	MR. LICUL: Your Honor, I think at some point there		
15	is an overkill factor. We already know what these folks have		
16	said.		
17	THE COURT: They're planning to call them. They		
18	have a right.		
19	MR. LICUL: But this case is sui generis to the		
20	extent they already have their testimony.		
21	THE COURT: In part		
22	MR. LICUL: Well, understood		
23	THE COURT: due to the other issues, which is		
24	scheduled for noon today with the Attorney General's Office.		
25	MR. LICUL: Well but the problem here, Your		

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

16

Honor is -- we're not opposing any of those depositions.

Those other witnesses may have specific objections related to

3 | that, for example, I think there's one witness who tried to --

4 who agreed to be deposed for two or three hours, which seems

5 like a perfectly sensible solution. They already have the

testimony. You'd have to fill in the gaps, as Your Honor

said, on these other issues. But we're not opposing that as a

rule. It goes above the 10-deposition rule.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. LICUL: And I know we understood from the beginning that there would be some play in that rule. I think at some point it becomes overkill.

THE COURT: Well, but not if you're not willing to limit your case. That is the dilemma that the Court is facing. The Court is facing a dilemma of respecting plaintiff's ability to try to tell the case within the bounds of the law -- Old Chief, my favorite case of all time -- and really develop the record that you need to present the case as you see fit to the jury. But if that is the plan, then Governor Cuomo shouldn't be entitled to an opportunity to contest whether or not that information comes in at all, and in order to do that, needs to develop some additional information as to relevance. And if those complainants do end up on the stand, having taken the deposition is obviously their preference.

Proceedings 17 But that is 11 women, including Trooper 1. 1 MR. LICUL: 2 THE COURT: I'm aware. 3 MR. LICUL: It's not the dozens or so that have been 4 either subpoenaed for documents or where there has been a 5 request for their depositions. It's well beyond that. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Fair enough. All right. Is 7 there anything else you would like to add? 8 MR. LICUL: No, Your Honor, just that to the extent 9 Your Honor has already -- hinted is the wrong word, but is 10 inclined to extend the discovery deadline, we want a firm 11 deadline and we would like it to be as soon as possible. 12 THE COURT: Of course. Thank you. I understand. 13 All right. Ms. Glavin, obviously there are many 14 issues on the table. I'm curious at some point to hear your 15 take on Mr. Licul's suggestion that we take a similar approach 16 to what we took as a party in DeRosa because, as you yourself have described, or maybe it was Ms. Trzaskoma -- I don't know 17 18 who the signatory was in the letter. I assume it was joint 19 work product. The discovery in this case is a mess and we are 20 trying to get done. 21 So what do you think we can do practically speaking, 22 and, of course, inform by our legal landscape? 23 MS. GLAVIN: Judge, look, the first question that I 24 was going to pose when we started today is the one that he 25 posed, and I was going to say to plaintiff's counsel if they

drop these other 10 complainants which comprise some 73 paragraphs, more than that, of the Complaint, then this is very simple and everybody sitting in the gallery can go home if this is about the Trooper 1 lawsuit which, of course, that's what we would prefer.

And, so, the reality we are facing -- and I want to address -- there were three points, because I think the record needs to be corrected. Governor Cuomo by no means is refusing to sit for his deposition. In fact, was ready, willing, and able to sit for his deposition. We scheduled it for August 23rd. Because we were not getting the documents that we needed, because none of the complainants were producing anything more, except for a couple, than what had been produced to -- they had already produced to the Attorney General's Office, we were simply not able to go forward. We were also getting new information from other depositions and in particular, a former member of the PSU detail.

Because of the information that we were getting, we said to plaintiff's counsel, look we need to push the deposition. It can't go forward. We also have all of these pending motions. We have not gotten documents we need, including from State Government entities, such as the executive chamber, how about September 27th? That was the date that we offered Mr. Licul, and he summarily rejected it and said that doesn't work for us, and we want to go ahead on

Proceedings

the 23rd. The Governor is going to sit for his deposition, but the reality is what is the scope of this case going to be, and is he going to sit for his deposition and be questioned about 10 other women, some of whom he didn't even know they were making allegations when he was deposed two years ago

during that deposition and we have to prep him for that.

So what we have said to Mr. Licul is to the extent you are including all of this in the case -- and we don't have an evidentiary, you know, boundary to this. We may. I strongly suspect we are going to be making a motion, but we need more information about the other allegations to do that. But if Mr. Licul is proposing let's just do discovery on Trooper 1's core allegations as they relate to her, then yes, if you want to do part one and part two. But the Governor is not going to sit for a deposition and be questioned about allegations by 10 other women, many of whom we have not been able to fully explore. We have transcripts that got publicly released that are heavily redacted.

THE COURT: I wouldn't say heavily. I don't agree with that characterization.

MS. GLAVIN: On a few of them there are large swathes that are unredacted that talk about other people and whose identities that we don't know what they're talking about and they are important to our case. So when you say large swathes, maybe no, it's not 20 percent or 10 percent are

Proceedings

redacted. But they're talking about specific people, specific witnesses and staffers and those names are blacked out.

We've already taken one deposition, and this is in our paper, Ms. Liss-Jackson, and we went through some of the names and she couldn't remember what she had said earlier.

I do -- I want to get back to relevance, but there were just a couple of other points with respect to Mr. Licul:

One is Governor Cuomo is not refusing to sit for the deposition. Mr. Licul knows that.

With respect to Trooper 1's deposition, I want to explain why we put off her deposition. Two days before Trooper 1 was to be deposed, we took the deposition testimony of a former colleague of hers in the PSU Diane Perrotta. On the eve of her testimony, we were provided with text messages that Diane Perrotta had with Trooper 1 discussing what it is that Trooper 1 wanted Diane Perrotta to testify to. And Mr. Licul talks about well, you know, you're subpoenaing kids' phones, her husband's phone. Diane Perrotta used her husband's telephone.

THE COURT: I understood from the papers is that her son?

MS. GLAVIN: Her daughter and her husband. She doesn't have a son --

THE COURT: A child.

MS. GLAVIN: It's her daughter and her husband, to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

get in touch with Trooper 1 so that there wouldn't be a record of it, and that is what caused us to get the phone records. We were very concerned about these communications happening when Diane Perrotta had been subpoenaed and in the weeks before the deposition. So that's why those phone records subpoenas went out. It was for a proper purpose, not meant to It was what are the extent of these communications. So we pushed off the deposition with consent of all counsel in the case, State Police and with counsel for Ms. DeRosa and Ms.

The second is that we had gotten Trooper 1's medical records only a couple weeks before and they were, you know, somewhat voluminous going through, but given that state of affairs, we knew that there were other troopers that we were going to have to subpoena, that we wanted their depositions before Trooper 1's. So I don't want the Court to think that we were canceling depositions.

Azzopardi because we had a reason.

I can tell you I got a very lengthy outline already prepared for Trooper 1's deposition. That changed drastically after Diane Perrotta's deposition.

The third thing I want to address with respect to plaintiff counsel discussing the Governor's cell phone, let's just be clear, Governor Cuomo has had three phones that were Thousands of images have been produced, okay, to imaged. Trooper 1 in this case that were responsive: Two Blackberries

Proceedings

and an iPhone.

What has been interesting to us is that we have not received a single text message that Trooper 1 has had that would be discussing the Governor, the case, the allegations, other than the text messages that got produced on the eve of Diane Perrotta's deposition where she is reaching out to Trooper 1 saying, to the effect, I know you have been brainwashed, tell me what to say, why are your lawyers reaching out to us? There's a series of maybe three text exchanges. And the representation we've got, when talking about ESI, from plaintiff's counsel is Trooper 1 simply didn't have electronic communications throughout the whole course of this. We'll explore that in the deposition.

But to be clear, we have produced I think 55,000 pages of documents, thousands of images from the Governor's phones, and so I don't want the Court to think that in any way -- not only have we not shirked the discovery obligations, that we have gone back and actually re-reviewed images to make sure that we're getting everything that's responsive.

On the issue of relevance and what the Court's -what Your Honor said when you came out on the bench about the
AG report, to the extent that is the impression the Court has,
that we are somehow trying to re-litigate this, Judge,
honestly, at this point in time, I don't care about the AG
report. I just want to get the discovery that we need so that

Proceedings

we are -- can prepare a case and whether it includes 73 paragraphs.

I mean, Lindsey Boylan, her name comes up 36 times in this Complaint. She's referenced in 26 paragraphs. There are documents that we need from Ms. Boylan that we know exists.

The AG report, you know, with respect to -- and I'll give you an example, with respect -- and we'll deal with this with Ms. Boylan, but quite frankly, we need to take our own discovery. We are not trying to recreate the AG report for a whole host of reasons, which I think you know that I feel about the AG report. We're not trying to recreate it. We are trying to defend.

THE COURT: At the prior or argument, there was a lengthy discussion about to needing to reduplicate the AG Office investigation, to be fair.

MS. GLAVIN: No. But the reason that happened, and I want to go back to that argument, both the Assembly Judiciary Committee and the Attorney General at that argument repeatedly told us to do it ourselves. They said subpoena the women, take their depositions, subpoena them for documents, do it yourself, and that's exactly what we have been doing since we had that argument. And the Court recommended that we do that. And that's what we've been doing. And what has happened is the morass that we are in now because no one wants to produce

Proceedings

anything, and no one wants to sit for a deposition. And so the question that I keep posing and -- is what is the relevance, because once we did, after the February conference, to do our own investigation, to test the veracity allegations and to prepare our defense is we got accused and continue to get accused of harassment, retaliation. I think maybe the favorite accusation -- not the favorite, but the most disappointing to me personally was that Ms. Trzaskoma and I were churning because we get to bill by the hours.

All we're trying to do here is what we do in every case, whether I do it as a criminal defense lawyer or civil lawyer, I need to be able to defend my client, and right now we don't and have a tenth of what we need if the case is this multi-hydra-headed with ten other people. I would prefer it just be Trooper 1.

Here's where we are with discovery: There have been -- Trooper 1 has taken six depositions. We have taken three. We have had one complainant, and we have taken two troopers. The one deposition we took of the complainant, which I think goes to the importance of why we need to take the testimony of all of the women in this case is that complainant, in her testimony, not only repeatedly said that she was not sexually harassed --

THE COURT: Her legal conclusion is irrelevant.

MS. GLAVIN: It's irrelevant, but she also said

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

repeated the Governor didn't touch her inappropriately. It's what a reasonable person would perceive. She said the Governor didn't touch her inappropriately, that a lot of what she said to the Attorney General's Office was not based on personal knowledge, it was based on hearsay. We need to get into those details.

She also said that when we received our subpoena she actually did believe that it was a reckoning because she became somewhat uncomfortable as to how her allegations had taken on a life of their own. And that is precisely why we need to take these depositions, because after taking Ana Liss-Jackson's deposition, there is no doubt in my mind that if we do a motion to strike, she won't be part of this case. And so that became the importance of that. But that's the only one.

What we also learned during Ms. Liss-Jackson's testimony is that Ms. Boylan, as soon as she got a subpoena, Ms. Boylan is texting Ana Liss-Jackson. Ms. Boylan released that subpoena to the Wall Street Journal. She got in touch with Ana Liss-Jackson by text. There were repeated texts that happened. And those are the types things we're looking for for Ms. Boylan. Ms. Jackson produced them. And she didn't have a problem producing them. She produced what she had. And we think she was quite honest during her testimony about this, about why she went to the press. She testified that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

Lindsey Boylan told her and claimed to have personal knowledge that the Governor was having affairs with two to three staffers, which, of course, was not true when Ms. Jackson believed it. She said that's one of the reasons she came forward, but that in her view she had not been sexually She knows what the definition of sexual harassment harassed. He didn't touch her in appropriately, and she rarely had personal contact with the Governor. The story that we had understood going into the deposition is that she believed she had been hired because of her looks. But when you spend time talking with her about it, she acknowledged that could have been true. She was hired by the Department of State for the fellows program. She wasn't even assigned to work on the Governor's side of the hall. She was working for the Lieutenant Governor for months. And then Howard Glaser hired her to come work for him because she was impressed with her work. And she said, Well, I began to think I was hired for my looks because other people told me that.

Our ability to drill down on this is so important. Again, would prefer not to. It would make this case a lot more streamline. So on the relevance front, I feel stuck.

Ms. Trzaskoma and I feel stuck, because with respect to subpoenas that have gone out -- and Mr. Licul talks about all the subpoenas that have gone out -- if you just had -let's just say if you have Lindsey Boylan's allegations alone,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

okay, which she's referenced in 20 paragraphs, her name is in the Complaint 36 times, she made a very serious allegation against the Governor, publicly told the world Governor Cuomo sexually harassed me for years, others watched and knew what It's a very serious allegation. If she had was happening. sued him, that alone, for us to have issued 10, 15 subpoenas for documents and get depositions, maybe two to three, that would be pretty reasonable, and I feel we have to do that

> THE COURT: Her college records?

because of what a large role she plays in the Complaint.

MS. GLAVIN: We're not asking for Lindsey Boylan's college records.

> THE COURT: I'm sorry. Is that Ms. Bennett?

MS. GLAVIN: That's Ms. Bennett. And actually, I want to -- we can talk about that. But with respect to Ms. Bennett, she has independently sued the Governor in the Southern District. We actually issued a subpoena for the college records. I think we are coming to an agreement. We're very close to an agreement with plaintiff's counsel. So that may all be for naught because of that other lawsuit.

With respect to Ms. Boylan, because of the allegations she made, which she told the world that she left, she implied to the world over a series of tweets in a week that she left because the Governor sexually harassed, that she wouldn't sign a non-disclosure agreement, that she was

> CSR MDL RPK CRK Officia, Court Reporter

privileged and she could opt out. Once all the statements

28

3

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

were made, what we know is that none of that was true. We know why she left. There are three memos documenting why she left. And in the eight months before she left, she had to have meetings twice with the Governor's counsel, one over a Complaint about her relationship with the head of ESD, Howard Zemsky, that they were involved in a sexual relationship and that there was an interaction in front of other ESD employees and there was a complaint, and then six to seven months later, counsel for the Empire State Development Corporation, Elizabeth Fine, and two others asked that she be removed from the ESD payroll because of massive complaints within the agency, on an agency-wide basis. That was the reason she left. And when she was brought to a meeting, she resigned. And then four days came back and tried to get her job back and said I love the Governor, I want to keep working there.

So it was a shock to everyone that Ms. Boylan is doing a series of tweets in the middle of a political campaign, that she left for a different reason that was a lie. We have to be able to explore that. I don't care who Lindsey Boylan slept with. I really don't care. What I do care is if this case is going to be about her allegations of sexual harassment, her telling the world that I left because of the Governor's Cuomo harassment and everybody saw it, we have to explore this because that's not why she left.

29

So I feel very stuck here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And if Your Honor wants to take those allegations out, I think everybody here would breathe a big sigh of relief and the case would be narrow. I wish the Complaint wasn't drafted this way. So, on the relevance front, again, the Attorney General's report, I don't care. What I care about is, the only thing I care about in report and the defense right now is, one, we don't want it coming in during trial. And the frustrating part is that in several depositions, the depositions of Ms. DeRosa and Mr. Azzopardi have just been taken, I can't tell you how many times the Attorney General's report came up in the depositions. Plaintiff's counsel asked each of them what about the report -- the investigators, in the manner they conducted it, was unethical? That was part of the line of questioning. And so, as a result of that, we had to then go through several hours of what they believed was problematic with the report. We don't want it to be a part of the case. But the reality it has been asked by plaintiff's counsel.

And I fully expect that in Governor's Cuomo deposition they're going to ask a lot of questions about the Attorney General's investigation, and I would prefer it not be part of the case because I don't think very much of that report, as the world knows. Let's not make it part of the case. But I have to deal with the allegations that were

MDL RPK CRK CSR Officia, Cour, Reporter

dealt. I have to be a defense lawyer.

And the last point I'm going to make is after all of the letters that went flying through over the last three weeks, over the number of meet-and-confers that I've had where, I kid you not, I feel like I have to put earplugs on to the degree at which I get yelled at by other lawyers. That is what actually happens during these.

I know now why some of my colleges from the Justice Department hates civil discovery. It's pretty brutal. All the letters flying back and forth. I just want to cut to the chase, tell us what you have that's responsive, how many documents do you have.

With each of these meet-and-confers, what happens is you have to tell us how it's relevant, and I'm like do you have responsive documents? Have you talked to your client? Who was your client talking to about the allegation? We are not getting those answers, which makes it so hard for us to narrow the subpoena. I would like to have these conversations in good faith.

I mean, take, for example, the subpoena to Lindsey Boylan. The irony of it is the subpoena we served to Lindsey Boylan looks pretty close to what the AG subpoena was to Lindsey Boylan. There are several categories that we have since learned about that we have asked about with respect to how she used the sexual harassment allegation to further her

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

campaign, because we think that was the motive, but what was so -- what's interesting to me. And why I don't care too much about what the Attorney General's report says or what she did is that Lindsey Boylan got subpoenaed from the AG's Office asking for all documents or communications concerning her or any other complainants about the Governor. All of her docs and communications reference contacts with the media, okay. Lindsey Boylan didn't produce any of that. She produced 25 pages. None of those 25 pages included her text messages back and forth, for instance, with Charlotte Bennett.

Then she testifies to the AG, despite having her only produced these 25 pages, she testifies to the AG, yeah, I texted with Charlotte all the time. And no one asked her for the texts. I can criticize the AG, but this is why I have to enforce our own subpoena, because what that produced there we know is incomplete.

There's nothing in her production. She published an article on Medium, My Story Working for Governor Cuomo. now know, in the weeks leading up to that article, she texts Kaitlin -- and I do want to be heard, because I want the ability to use Kaitlin's last name, because I don't think its right or it's fair given what her allegations are, but she texts Kaitlin like two or three weeks before she writes the article asking her: Do you know where the 2016 holiday party was for the Governor? The reason she's asking that is because

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

she's trying to put it in her article and it does appear in her article.

Why was none of this produced when it was already subpoenaed the first time? Put that to the side. We have to get it this time.

So, again, I would love for this to be out of the I'm asking for your help. case.

THE COURT: I can't kick the allegations out of the case in the absence of a motion, as you well know.

> MS. GLAVIN: Yes.

THE COURT: So part of my question for the parties today, and this is sincere, Mr. Licul, are there some boundaries that the parties are willing to work out in terms of what this case is going to look like at trial?

I understand you don't want to pre-litigate your case in motion practice during discovery. But this may be the rare case where the interest of the third-parties and the totality of the circumstances call for some of that litigation in an effort to discover the bounds of appropriate relevance.

If Ana Liss-Jackson's went as badly for you as Ms. Glavin represented, I would be surprised if you want to call her in your case. You may have a completely different take on how she's relevant or why you want to call her. I have no idea. Similar to some of the other complainants, if these complainants have a lot of other collateral issues that are

	Proceedings 33
1	going to be sources of rich cross-examination, do you actually
2	plan to call them? Because if you don't, putting them through
3	this discovery process is wrong.
4	MR. LICUL: May I be heard, Your Honor?
5	THE COURT: Yes.
6	MR. LICUL: A couple of things. One is we have
7	every right to put these witnesses on if we choose to
8	strategically and we don't have to make that decision right
9	now.
10	THE COURT: No, you don't know, but there may be
11	motion practice, in which case it will be pre-litigated. I'm
12	giving you
13	MR. LICUL: I understand.
14	THE COURT: the opportunity to discuss it with
15	them and figure out whether or not there may be a boundary
16	that you can live with.
17	MR. LICUL: Let me just say this, okay, this is not
18	a case I can't speak to the other lawyers where the
19	plaintiffs and the defendants' lawyers are at each other
20	throats.
21	MS. GLAVIN: Oh, yes. I should make that clear.
22	It's not. I should make that clear, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Good to know.
24	MS. GLAVIN: We actually we have been able to
25	work, I think, quite collaboratively to come up with

Proceedings

solutions. The -- I think the most difficult part has been with some of the nonparties. And I think the tenor of the discussions have been, frankly, disappointing, not with all of them.

THE COURT: I'm sure they feel re-traumatized to the extent that they originally experienced trauma. And that's part of the problem with this strategy, Mr. Licul. With all respect to Trooper 1's ability to present this case, if this is not really a viable strategy legally, it's not ethically right to put them through this, and you know that.

MR. LICUL: Your Honor, I have an ethical obligation to zealously try my client's case.

THE COURT: Correct. Within the bounds of the law.

And if there are significant questions that touch upon whether or not this information is going to come in, I'm wondering if this is the rare case where we need to do things in a different order.

MR. LICUL: Let me just -- because Ms. Glavin has given some examples where she said they've acted unreasonably, and as much as I like Ms. Glavin, she's just wrong.

Let's take Ms. Perrotta. They have subpoenaed her phone records. Her husband's phone records and her daughter's phone records.

THE COURT: She was collaborating with Trooper 1 on her testimony, that seems like a fair swath of subpoenas.

	Proceedings 35
1	MR. LICUL: Your Honor, if I may
2	THE COURT: And she included them in her papers, by
3	the way, those texts.
4	MR. LICUL: We provided those texts.
5	THE COURT: Yes.
6	MR. LICUL: I understand. The allegation is that
7	Ms. Perrotta reached out to Trooper 1 and Trooper 1 never
8	picked up her call. Now, that's not evidence of some grand
9	conspiracy. That's evidence of no conspiracy. But let me
10	tell you what we did offer to avoid any burden on Ms.
11	Perrotta. We've offered to produce to Cuomo's camp the phone
12	records that the correspondence phone number to phone
13	number, between Trooper 1 and and Ms. Perrotta and her
14	husband, and her daughter. In other words, we've said we will
15	give you those records. We have them. We'll give them to
16	you. Not good enough, that seems like a perfect sensible
17	solution to the problem.
18	Why don't they do it? Because they want the full
19	phone records. They want to go on a fishing expedition. Let
20	me talk a little bit about the reasons why Governor Cuomo
21	won't be deposed.
22	THE COURT: Governor Cuomo will be deposed.
23	MR. LICUL: No. But he wants to go last, Your
24	Honor. He has no right to go last. There is not a single
25	case in this district or in this Circuit that says that a

defendant has a right to wait it out. And the cases go other way. He is a party -

THE COURT: I'm sorry. We are not addressing the timing of Governor Cuomo's deposition today. We have a gallery full of third-parties. This is not the appropriate time to talk about the exact timing of Governor Cuomo's deposition. There are a myriad other pressing discovery issues in this case. I assure you that Governor Cuomo will be deposed. Defense counsel knows that. The question of timing is one that is factually complex and not necessary to talk about today when we have all these other folks waiting.

MR. LICUL: I understand, Your Honor. It is the subject of one of our motions.

THE COURT: I recognize that.

I started to say there's no motion and then I remember there was, so I stopped. But I do recognize that's one of your motions. The motion is not ripe because there's so many discovery issues outstanding. I wouldn't want to take their deposition if I were their counsel either, and I'm surprised you do, because if you don't have all of the other information that may be coming in, I would imagine there would be a number of things that you would like to ask him about.

MR. LICUL: We are prepared to take his deposition. We have been prepared to take his deposition. He is a party, I've always litigated these cases that the parties go first.

In fact, some of your colleagues, Your Honor, put that in their rules, that the parties go first, and I think it's a perfectly sensible solution.

Let me just talk about Ana Liss-Jackson for one second. And I understand Your Honor said that her legal conclusion is irrelevant, and I agree. What Ms. Liss-Jackson said was that she thought the environment was Mad Menesque and that she was treated less well because she's a woman. That is the very definition of discrimination.

Now, with respect to the report, they say they don't want to touch the report. That is untrue. Just last week they subpoenaed the Cleary firm and the Vladeck firm for all of their documents concerning the AG's.

MS. GLAVIN: That's not so. That's not --

MR. LICUL: Why would they do that? They were appointed as attorney -- as Deputy Attorney Generals to do the investigation. Your Honor, denied the request to turn over the AG's records, yet they went ahead and subpoenaed the firms anyway.

THE COURT: Is that the billing records?

MS. GLAVIN: No, Your Honor. We subpoenaed them. We're trying to get the interview memos, which are up on motion for reconsideration before the Court.

THE COURT: That's not -- that's for later.

MS. GLAVIN: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings 38 THE COURT: This is for 12:00. You're welcome to stay when the Attorney General's Office is here. MR. LICUL: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Things touching upon the Attorney General's Office are scheduled for 12:00. I was just responding to Ms. Glavin's MR. LICUL: argument that they have been acting reasonably and they don't care about the report. It's just not true. Anyway, Your Honor I don't know that I have anything else unless Your Honor has a question for me. THE COURT: No. What I'm lacking is solutions, right. Everyone agrees this is a mess, Mr. Licul has suggested a process similar to the one we have employed for

right. Everyone agrees this is a mess, Mr. Licul has suggested a process similar to the one we have employed for defendants Mr. Azzopardi and Ms. DeRosa, but, you know, I don't know if something similar would work for the third-parties.

MS. GLAVIN: So I wanted to understand precisely what the process is. Is the proposal on the table that there's no discovery with respect to the nonparties and it's just discovery on the Trooper case?

THE COURT: That was not his suggestion. As I understood the suggestion, correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Licul, is that the third-parties, at a minimum, would give you the documents that were provided to the Attorney General's Office and from there, meet and confer in an effort to

determine what additional documents are needed.

MS. GLAVIN: So here's the issue, we have gotten -so Lindsey Boylan produced to us what she produced to the
Attorney General's Office: 25 pages. We know that she has
had extensive communications with the press about her
allegations, with other complainants about her allegations,
including, you know, up to recently. We need those. We've
looked at the 25 pages and it's just relatively worthless to
us.

We got a production of documents from, I think it's Kaitlin and Ana Liss. Ana Liss gave us more than what she gave the AG's Office.

That's basically what the proposal has been for all of the nonparties. But there's very little in those, and we don't know the degree to which the Attorney General's Office renegotiated those. For instance, Charlotte Bennett hasn't produced to us any of the documents that she produced to the Attorney General's Office.

THE COURT: You also mentioned that Charlotte

Bennett is the plaintiff in the Southern District case. What is the status of the discovery there? I don't believe her counsel is here today. What is the status?

MS. GLAVIN: Yes.

MR. COHEN: I represent Charlotte Bennett.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. What was your name, sir?

MDL RPK CRK CSR Officia, Cour, Reporter _

_

1 1

	Proceedings 40
1	MR. EISENBERG: Herbert Eisenberg.
2	THE COURT: Herbert Eisenberg. Okay. Thank you.
3	MS. GLAVIN: Discovery has just started. Document
4	requests were made and the parties are making objections.
5	There are different parties in that case, additional
6	defendants in that case. The discovery deadline now is set
7	for June of 2024.
8	One of the reasons we subpoenaed Ms. Bennett is
9	because we were facing this discovery deadline in this case
10	for the 26th. I think we can work a lot of this stuff out,
11	and I'm amenable to doing that with Ms. Bennett, the problem
12	is I can't speak for Ms. DeRosa and Mr. Azzopardi, who are
13	defendants in this case. You know, there are going to be some
14	different issues in the two cases.
15	THE COURT: The other defendants are not named in
16	the
17	MS. GLAVIN: One is not. Ms. DeRosa is. There is a
18	motion to dismiss pending for all of the claims against Ms.
19	DeRosa, but I can let Ms. Foti address that.
20	THE COURT: Ms. Foti, can we resolve the Charlotte
21	Bennett matters in the Charlotte Bennett case or is there a
22	risk of conflicting rulings? That's my concern.
23	MS. FOTI: Well, I think there's certainly a risk of
24	conflicting rulings. But I will tell you why I don't think we
25	can resolve it just by the Charlotte Bennett case. Unless Mr.

Licul removes from his Complaint reliance on Charlotte Bennett as a reason why my client Ms. DeRosa would have been on notice of sexual harassment, we have to depose Ms. Bennett. We have to get her documents.

Right now, I have to tell you, the people who are suffering the most prejudice in this case -- I hear the parties saying they're suffering prejudice. It's my clients. My clients -- Melissa DeRosa say hello and goodbye to Trooper 1. Richard Azzopardi doesn't know Trooper 1. There's no claim that they did anything to participate in Governor Cuomo harassment. That is the requirement; they did something, that they knew something. There's no claim in the Complaint that any of that is true. Notwithstanding that, they're participating. They have sat through their depositions. Nothing came out during the depositions to suggest that they did anything to participate in the sexual harassment.

Notwithstanding that, we have to depose all of third-parties as well because, as I understand the theory of the plaintiff's case, is that because all these other individuals claim that they were harassed. Ms. DeRosa must have known. And Mr. Azzopardi, even in their answers to the motion to dismiss, say maybe Mr. Azzopardi participated -- aided and abetted in Governor Cuomo's sexual harassment as well. We have to have an opportunity to question that.

If Mr. Licul wants to drop our clients, that would

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

We have been waiting for a decision on the motion be great. to dismiss because we don't think there's sufficient allegations against our clients in the Complaint. If they want to drop, then we need nothing further in this case.

If he wants to continue to say that Melissa DeRosa and Richard Azzopardi were aiders and abettors and enabled Governor Cuomo's alleged sexual harassment, then we need to have responses to the subpoenas as well. Our subpoenas are very limited. But what's interesting to me is that we can't just say well, if we're going to negotiate the subpoenas for Governor Cuomo, that's it. We need to be able to question the -- all these third-parties on what they apparently think Ms. DeRosa knew, what they think Ms. DeRosa saw, what they believe Mr. Azzopardi may have done to enable Governor Cuomo's sexual harassment.

So I'm not positive the negotiated -- you know, this concept of negotiating something similar to what we have done, I'm not positive how that would work. We have very limited document requests and a number of the third-parties have said they don't have documents responsive. We're asking for documents relating to Melissa DeRosa and Richard Azzopardi. We're not asking for every document in the world. A number of them have said that they don't have those documents or they have already produced them in response to Governor Cuomo's subpoenas. And we have been working with the third-parties to

Proceedings 43 1 say okay, if that's the case, we're not going to pursue that, 2 but we need to pursue the deposition of the third-party. 3 THE COURT: Thank you. 4 MS. FOTI: I'm not sure how we can negotiate a settlement without having them testify. 5 6 I understand. THE COURT: 7 And on behalf of the New York State Police, Mr. 8 Palermo, what do you think as to this proposal? Would this 9 work for you? 10 MR. PALERMO: Your Honor, are you talking about the 11 proposal of providing the documents from the AG initially --12 THE COURT: And then meeting and conferring and 13 trying to resolve things prior to filing -- the problem with 14 motions to compel -- there are many, many problems with 15 motions to compel. One of them is they take a really long 16 time because you have to file it and then they have to respond 17 and then people sometimes file a reply. Whether that is 18 really all permitted under our local rules, it is not. People 19 still do it. And it takes weeks. In the meantime, other 20 motions are getting file and then they cross apply to issues. 21 It's an extremely insufficient process. 22 My individual rules require a joint statement of 23 each dispute, jointly stated in one filing so that everybody 24

knows what the universe of information for that dispute is. That method, which is in my individual rules, really hasn't

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

44

been followed in this case, with the exception of, in the beginning, there was one small issue that bubbled up and we had a conference and then resolved it in that conference.

But there are so many problems with motions to compel and they are extraordinarily inefficient. So my goal is to try to find some guidelines for the parties and the nonparties to sort of just better move through this discovery As the attorneys for the nonparties are hearing, I know many of your clients likely think that Governor Cuomo is trying to continue to harass or victimize them. The issues that the Court is struggling with in this case, as you've heard, are these wide scope of the plaintiff's allegations in the Complaint. And if that is the universe of information that Governor Cuomo is being asked to defend against. There's a lot of discovery that he may need to take in order to move to strike those allegation, move to narrow the discovery that come in at trial, or defend himself if all of those witnesses are ultimately called. That's the problem. I would think that all of you, as advocates for the third-parties, would also be very interested in meeting and conferring with Mr. Licul and Ms. Glavin in an effort to narrow what this case is going to look like, because if this case is really going to be all 11 complainants coming into court testifying this discovery process is going to be quite laborious and unfortunately further expose your clients to addition process.

Anyway, back to the New York State Police.

MR. PALERMO: Thank you, Your Honor. Given the stance we find ourself in right now, we would be amenable to proceeding with that proposal. I suppose having some production at least to get things going might be beneficial since we're not moving very quickly anywhere.

A lot of information being sought in the subpoenas isn't necessarily relevant to the allegations specifically against the New York State Police, so we don't necessarily take a position one way or the other on a lot of the subpoenas. But, you know, our client would be amenable to cooperating with that proposal if we want to move forward in that direction.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Licul, do you have an idea?

MR. LICUL: I have an idea or I just have a clarification in response to Ms. Foti and her client.

The allegations against Mr. Azzopardi are limited. He is being accused of retaliating against Trooper 1 and aiding and abetting the Governor's retaliation against her by calling her an extortionist. He is not being accused of being an aider and abettor to the sexual harassment. And what we learned from Mr. Azzopardi's deposition is that when Trooper 1 filed this action, he and the Governor sat down together and drafted a tweet that called her an extortionist. The tweet

Proceedings

was sent out under Mr. Azzopardi's name presumably so no one could trace it back to the Governor. But that is what the allegations are against Mr. Azzopardi.

The allegations against Ms. DeRosa are twofold: One is that she too at some point sent out a tweet accusing Trooper 1 of committing a crime of extortion; and two, that she aided and abetted the sexual harassment because, among other things, she buried a story about how it was that Trooper 1 got on to the PSU. She had specific involvement in that. Okay. And, so -- and, so, I want to be clear about those allegations.

With respect to the Governor, there is no reason on this good earth that the Governor could not testify. He already has, in fact, testified about his interactions with each of the victims. He knows what happened. He doesn't need their testimony. He's already got it anyway. He doesn't need it. What he's trying to do is trying to attack their credibility extraneously with outside evidence. I think that that's the problem. But I'm not sure if that was the solution.

THE COURT: That's clear, but that's part of defending our case.

MR. LICUL: To an extent.

THE COURT: It's your position they're not entitled to discover impeachment material? I'm not understanding your

argument.

MR. LICUL: No. I think that the scope of the impeachment material will depend, right. It depends on how far you're going to go. Are you going to dig under every single rock for every witness and see everything that they've ever done?

THE COURT: Well, you were, just a moment ago, taking the position that you need to zealously advocate for your client.

MR. LICUL: I understand that, but there are limits to zealous advocacy and at some point the zealous advocacy crosses the line and the information you're looking at, you're just not going to get in, right.

THE COURT: Agreed, and that is why I am asking you to also look hard at your case and truly evaluate whether or not this evidence is going to come in and have meaningful meet and confers with the litigants who are the third-parties here, because putting them through this deposition process and continuing to re-traumatize some of these individuals when this stuff may or may not come in depending upon what temporal proximity, overlapping work environment, all of the things that one would look at to establish whether or not there is a 404(b) exception and/or it comes in under the hostile work environment discussion outlined in the *Perry* case.

It is not at all clear to me, Mr. Licul, and I don't

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

think it would be clear to any jurist on the basis of the current record that all of these victim's testimonies are going to come in. So what I implore you to do, sir, is exactly what you just described you would like to the Cuomo people to do, and I would like you to do it to. You need to be strategic and you need to re- evaluate what you think is

coming in. And if you're willing to cut some stuff, great.

Similarly, if the Cuomo people, if they can stop you know, looking -- I mean, subpoenaing all of the phone records under the sun is not going to happen, and I think Ms. Glavin But some discovery of impeachment, and certainly if there is any collusion, they're going to be entitled to some leverage of discovery there.

MR. LICUL: If they think that Ms. Perrotta concluded with Trooper 1, they could have asked Trooper 1 at her deposition. I mean, that's the first place to look, right? What did you say to Diane Perrotta? Right. understand going after her, you know, everything else about And accusing her of perjury is pretty heavy-handed. They don't have any evidence that she perjured herself. It is intended to intimidate a witness.

Now, with respect to Your Honor's first point on the scope of the evidence that's get in, they have not cited to us a single case where other harassment by the perpetrator was not admitted. That's not what we are talking about.

	Proceedings 49
1	other cases say that perhaps discrimination by others in the
2	employment world, another supervisor or another co-employee
3	may not be relevant to the employer's knowledge or some other
4	but where we're talking about the actual perpetrator, I
5	haven't found that case, and I welcome them to show it to me.
6	We can talk about it. I have no problem talking to Ms. Glavin
7	about anything. But that's just not the law.
8	And I think that they know what these witnesses are
9	going to say. They've already testified under oath. There
10	may be some latitude there. I just don't see that it's this
11	broad.
12	Anyway, I understand Your Honor's instruction.
13	THE COURT: One other question.
14	MR. LICUL: Sure.
15	THE COURT: Do you anticipate seeking to introduce
16	portions of the report?
17	MR. LICUL: Yes.
18	THE COURT: And I assume that's under Rule 803(8).
19	MR. LICUL: Yes.
20	THE COURT: What portions?
21	MR. LICUL: I'm not sure just yet, Your Honor.
22	That's not been teed up. But I think there are portions of
23	the report, and perhaps the Assembly report, that would be
24	relevant under 803(8).
25	And there's also a second piece of this, which is

because we have the State here as a defendant, there may be a party admission pact to getting the report in as well. THE COURT: I mean, as you know under 803(8), the admissibility in a civil context is limited to MR. LICUL: It's the factual findings, Your Honor THE COURT: Factual findings. Exactly. MR. LICUL: from a legally authorized investigation. THE COURT: Right. MR. LICUL: This was a legally authorized investigation. THE COURT: I don't think that's going to be contested. But what are factual findings in the context of hearsay? MR. LICUL: I'm not sure all of this is hearsay, Your Honor. THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are that these people told things to the investigators. MR. LICUL: Right.)
THE COURT: I mean, as you know under 803(8), the admissibility in a civil context is limited to MR. LICUL: It's the factual findings, Your Honor THE COURT: Factual findings. Exactly. MR. LICUL: from a legally authorized investigation. THE COURT: Right. MR. LICUL: This was a legally authorized investigation. THE COURT: I don't think that's going to be contested. But what are factual findings in the context of hearsay? MR. LICUL: I'm not sure all of this is hearsay, Your Honor. THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are that these people told things to the investigators.	
admissibility in a civil context is limited to MR. LICUL: It's the factual findings, Your Honor THE COURT: Factual findings. Exactly. MR. LICUL: from a legally authorized investigation. THE COURT: Right. MR. LICUL: This was a legally authorized investigation. THE COURT: I don't think that's going to be contested. But what are factual findings in the context of hearsay? MR. LICUL: I'm not sure all of this is hearsay, Your Honor. THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are that these people told things to the investigators.	
MR. LICUL: It's the factual findings, Your Honor THE COURT: Factual findings. Exactly. MR. LICUL: from a legally authorized investigation. THE COURT: Right. MR. LICUL: This was a legally authorized investigation. THE COURT: I don't think that's going to be contested. But what are factual findings in the context of hearsay? MR. LICUL: I'm not sure all of this is hearsay, Your Honor. THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are that these people told things to the investigators.	
THE COURT: Factual findings. Exactly. MR. LICUL: from a legally authorized investigation. THE COURT: Right. MR. LICUL: This was a legally authorized investigation. THE COURT: I don't think that's going to be contested. But what are factual findings in the context of hearsay? MR. LICUL: I'm not sure all of this is hearsay, Your Honor. THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are that these people told things to the investigators.	
7 MR. LICUL: from a legally authorized 8 investigation. 9 THE COURT: Right. 10 MR. LICUL: This was a legally authorized 11 investigation. 12 THE COURT: I don't think that's going to be 13 contested. But what are factual findings in the context of 14 hearsay? 15 MR. LICUL: I'm not sure all of this is hearsay, 16 Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are 18 that these people told things to the investigators.	
THE COURT: Right. MR. LICUL: This was a legally authorized investigation. THE COURT: I don't think that's going to be contested. But what are factual findings in the context of hearsay? MR. LICUL: I'm not sure all of this is hearsay, Your Honor. THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are that these people told things to the investigators.	
THE COURT: Right. MR. LICUL: This was a legally authorized investigation. THE COURT: I don't think that's going to be contested. But what are factual findings in the context of hearsay? MR. LICUL: I'm not sure all of this is hearsay, Your Honor. THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are that these people told things to the investigators.	
10 MR. LICUL: This was a legally authorized 11 investigation. 12 THE COURT: I don't think that's going to be 13 contested. But what are factual findings in the context of 14 hearsay? 15 MR. LICUL: I'm not sure all of this is hearsay, 16 Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are 18 that these people told things to the investigators.	
11 investigation. 12 THE COURT: I don't think that's going to be 13 contested. But what are factual findings in the context of 14 hearsay? 15 MR. LICUL: I'm not sure all of this is hearsay, 16 Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are 18 that these people told things to the investigators.	
THE COURT: I don't think that's going to be contested. But what are factual findings in the context of hearsay? MR. LICUL: I'm not sure all of this is hearsay, Your Honor. THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are that these people told things to the investigators.	
contested. But what are factual findings in the context of hearsay? MR. LICUL: I'm not sure all of this is hearsay, Your Honor. THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are that these people told things to the investigators.	
hearsay? MR. LICUL: I'm not sure all of this is hearsay, Your Honor. THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are that these people told things to the investigators.	
MR. LICUL: I'm not sure all of this is hearsay, Your Honor. THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are that these people told things to the investigators.	
Your Honor. THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are that these people told things to the investigators.	
THE COURT: The facts, as I read the report, are that these people told things to the investigators.	
18 that these people told things to the investigators.	
19 MR. LICUL: Right.	
•	
THE COURT: That doesn't make what they told the	
21 investigators true, I mean. So what are the facts that you	
22 are seeking to introduce?	
MR. LICUL: Well, what they told the investigators,	
24 the factual findings, what the investigators found, in other	
words, the holdings of the investigators	

51

THE COURT: That's the investigators' conclusion and those are mixed questions of law and fact and that's really what I'm getting at. Under the 803(8), the legal conclusions are not likely to come in, as you know. And I think a lot of what's blurring the lines here is this belief that people have an understanding of their own experience of sexual harassment that may comport with legal definitions. It doesn't necessarily. And it is highly, highly prejudicial under Rule 403. 803(8), doesn't throw 403 out the window.

MR. LICUL: That's right, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So the question then is they don't know what portion of the report you plan to introduce and if you're, in fact, seeking to introduce the factual findings, whatever they are, which is really unclear to me, they're in very uncertain terrain in the discovery process here.

MR. LICUL: Well, I mean, this is like no different than any other case where the EEOC --

THE COURT: There is no other case like this, Mr. Licul.

MR. LICUL: That may be true.

With respect to this point, Your Honor, the Second Circuit has clearly said that investigations are not per se admissible.

THE COURT: Exactly.

MR. LICUL: They are still subject to the balancing

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	Proceedings 52
1	test of 403, but they're not per se inadmissible.
2	THE COURT: Legal conclusions are pretty
3	inadmissible under the language of the rule and the case law.
4	MR. LICUL: No, but the factual findings are not, so
5	if the
6	THE COURT: Sexual harassment is not a factual
7	finding.
8	MR. LICUL: No, but a factual finding that something
9	happened on a particular day.
10	THE COURT: Maybe. Maybe. But it is still hearsay.
11	MR. LICUL: It wouldn't be hearsay because this is
12	not hearsay.
13	THE COURT: It's a hearsay exception.
14	MR. LICUL: But it's not an exception. It's
15	actually not hearsay, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: So there's layers of complexity to this,
17	is the point.
18	MR. LICUL: That I agree.
19	THE COURT: And Ms. Glavin and Ms. Trzaskoma, as
20	discussed at length in the hearing we had regarding the
21	Attorney General's report and the AJC report, you know,
22	there's a lot of issues inherent in introducing this report
23	that they can't fully test because they can't get the
24	underlying investigative materials to it due to various
25	rulings I have made so far. We're revisiting some of those

questions at noon. It will probably be a little later than noon, if Mr. Amer is here.

So you know, this is a really complicated question and because the way this discovery is going may again need to be addressed earlier in the process than in motion in limine perhaps right before trial. I mean, is this something we need to deal with? Do we need to deal with the universe of witnesses and the scope of the admissibility of the report now?

MR. LICUL: No.

THE COURT: Because I don't see a way forward, Mr. Licul, other than continue what they are doing. Those are sort of options that seem to be on the table.

MR. LICUL: I don't understand why an 803(8) analysis would allow them to do the discovery that they are asking for. Let's say, for example, a witness says Governor did this to me on this day and, let's say, the report says we find --

THE COURT: Let me give you one clue, 803(B), the opponent -- this is a record or a statement of a public office can come in if the opponent does not show that the source of information or other circumstances indicate a lack of trustworthiness. I'm quite certain, based on our prior discussions in this case, that they're seeking to establish that the report lacks trustworthiness.

	Proceedings 54
1	MR. LICUL: But they have the sworn testimony of the
2	witnesses upon which the findings are based.
3	THE COURT: And based on their one complainant's
4	deposition so far, they take issue with how the report
5	characterizes their testimony.
6	MR. LICUL: Okay. We take issue with their
7	characterization of it.
8	THE COURT: Of course you do.
9	MR. LICUL: I understand.
10	THE COURT: This is why this is front and center in
11	their discovery efforts.
12	MR. LICUL: No, but, Your Honor, if what they're
13	saying typically, when we're talking about trustworthiness
14	in this context of discrimination, it will be an EEOC finding
15	that's one page long with no investigation, and then it's
16	often the defendant who will say we have a no probable cause
17	finding, we would like to introduce this to the jury, and the
18	judge says no, it lacks trustworthiness because there was no
19	investigation, nothing happened. That's the scope of the
20	trustworthiness rule.
21	In this particular case, they cannot argue that.
22	They can argue that Tish James wanted to be the governor, that
23	Preet Bharara was out to get him.
24	THE COURT: No one wants this trial to be about
25	that. I can assure you that Judge DeArcy Hall does not want

this trial to be about that.

MR. LICUL: Neither do we, but the point is, Your Honor, that's their attack on trustworthiness. Their attack on trustworthiness is not you didn't do an investigation, you didn't interview people, you didn't, you know -- you didn't do the inquiry you're supposed to do.

THE COURT: Their argument as to Jackson is that the conclusions of the investigators were wrong.

MR. LICUL: But Ana Liss-Jackson's testimony they have. And Ana Liss-Jackson testified about her interactions with the Governor. And Ana Liss-Jackson's testimony, regardless of what her legal conclusions are, is the very definition of a hostile work environment where woman are supposed to act a certain way, look a certain way, where they get attention from the Governor, a wink from the Governor because they are women, and attractive women. It is the boilerplate definition of sexual harassment. She described it as Mad Menesque. I cannot think of what else that would mean other than we are going back to the 50s in terms of the environment. That's what we are talking about here.

Anyway, we can argue about what Jackson's said.

THE COURT: Correct. That's the problem. There's so many layers of factual complexity here, trying to rule on evidentiary parameters on the basis of the present record is very, very difficult, if not impossible, without having

MDL RPK CRK CSR Officia, Cour, Reporter

Proceedings

full-blown evidentiary hearings on this motion to compel and nobody wants to do that either. So that's why I'm trying to find some sort of strategy that the parties can employ to meaningfully engage and narrow these disputes in an effort to move this discovery process along.

In the meantime, the third-parties are here. I see many lawyers waiting. They have an important interest at stake as well.

MR. LICUL: Your Honor, I will -- lacking any creativity here, I will just repeat what I said earlier, which is they can produce what the witnesses produced to the AG's Office. And if there are gaps, they can have that discussion with the witnesses and explain why they need more. It worked for DeRosa and Azzopardi. I don't see any reason why it wouldn't work here.

THE COURT: Let me ask the third-parties what they have produced, what they are prepared to produce, and whether or not they consent to the Attorney General's release of their information. Those are some of the questions that I have for the third-parties, because that is another way that I need to -- again, I don't know if the Attorney General's Office is going to be amenable to my suggestion in the order that I issued in connection with the prior opinion in this case. But they seem to be, so we will see.

My understanding, and please let me know if there

	Proceedings 57
1	are additional attorneys who have come and who have not stated
2	their appearance. I have a Mr. Capezza for State employee 2,
3	Ms. Cohen here for Ms. Hinton. And is that a colleague
4	sitting next to you?
5	MS. WANG: I represent Ms. Limmiatis and Ms.
6	McGrath.
7	THE COURT: Could you spell your last name for me?
8	MS. WANG: W-A-N-G.
9	THE COURT: Okay. And then Mr. Eisenberg has
10	introduced himself.
11	I recognize Mr. Najmi.
12	And then is there anybody else on behalf of
13	third-parties?
14	MS. SALZMAN: Zoe Salzman on behalf of non-party
15	Kaitlin Doe.
16	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Capezza
17	MS. PERRY: Your Honor
18	THE COURT: Yes, of course. You've put your
19	appearance on the record already.
20	All right. So Ms. Boylan has obviously been the
21	subject of a lot of conversation today. Ms. Perry, you are
22	sitting by a microphone.
23	Mr. Capezza, if you wouldn't mind just holding on
24	one, Ms. Boylan's attorneys probably have a lot they would
25	like to say in response to many of the things that have been

said today.

Ms. Perry, would you like to start?

I have three basic questions for all of the third-parties, which is one, what, if anything, have you given in response to subpoenas?

Two, what are you willing to give?

Three, do you have an objection to the release of information that the Attorney General's Office has regarding your client, including the unredacted transcript, and anything that was provided to the Attorney General's Office?

Their interview memos are something that the Cuomo people are also seeking. Whether or not those are protected by other privileges is a separate question. But I'm curious what your client's position is with regard to the release of interview memos.

MS. PERRY: Your Honor, I do have a lot to say and I hope we will get to it, but as to that narrow question, we have already produced, as counsel has said, documents that have been produced to the AG's Office. We, of course, have no problem with that. Ms. Glavin seemed to insinuate that Ms. Boylan had underproduced, but she also acknowledged that she was not party to the back and forth between Ms. Boylan's counsel and the AG's Office. That was an agreed upon accommodation and she produced what she produced to the satisfaction of the AG's Office. So, of course, we would be

#: 5601 Proceedings 59 1 amenable to that suggestion, that we -- you know, that is the 2 limit of what would be produced. 3 THE COURT: That's all your willing to provide? 4 MS. PERRY: Well, we did have a meet and confer with counsel. I did not yell at Ms. Glavin --5 6 MS. GLAVIN: She did not. 7 MS. PERRY: And we had made clear an openness to 8 producing additional categories of documents, specifically --9 and I can go through the exact document request, but documents 10 that broadly spoke to or where Ms. Boylan and others spoke to 11 the specific allegations that Ms. Boylan has made in the past 12 against Mr. Cuomo. But we said if the parties -- if the 13 defendants were willing to make that comprise, we would be 14 done, and we would not produce other documents pursuant to the 15 They rejected that. But we were very clear, other requests. 16 and I'm clear here today, that we do not agree and never will 17 agree to produce documents that go to all these other 18 categories: Ms. Boylan's sexual history, her campaign 19 fundraising, her, you know, employment records, and complaints 20 that were allegedly made against her. We do not agree and we 21 spoke about that extensively in our papers. 22 THE COURT: Is it true that Ms. Boylan made public 23 statements that the harassment is why she left?

MS. PERRY: Yes, she did. She was the first person to tweet about her experience of sexual harassment, by the

24

25

Proceedings

Governor and she made public statements about why she had left. That was explored by the Attorney General and she produced any documents that were agreed upon between her and the AG's Office.

THE COURT: If there are other documents shedding light on additional reasons she left or was asked to leave, why wouldn't that be relevant in light of that public tweet?

MS. PERRY: The problem here -- there is, of course, under Rule 26, a relevance component and proportionality, and we are so far outside of any universe of proportionality here. When they're trying to explore that and they're saying they are entitled to get communications between someone who worked on her campaign and Ms. Boylan about why this other person resigned hoping that may be it goes to something having to do with her political motivations, that is way too far afield.

Just within the past month, Ms. Boylan's college intern on her campaign was subpoenaed by all the defendants in this case. This is way too far afield. Your Honor has talked about boundaries. There are none in this case.

And so, I couldn't agree more with Your Honor's admonition or suggestion that perhaps the parties should work this out. I think all of the victims would agree with Your Honor's characterization that they have been re-traumatized by this. Ms. Boylan certainly feels that way. I think there is plenty of blame on both sides of the aisle for that.

If the parties could agree on what the limits are, what the boundaries are, I'm sure everybody -- I certainly can speak for my client -- would appreciate that.

Some of the questions Your Honor has raised about well, these other allegations of sexual harassment, if they have nothing to do with Trooper 1's workplace, do they come in? I understand that plaintiff might not have to do that now.

Your Honor spoke about moral and ethical, you know, reasons, and I actually think that should be the consideration here. When you are talking about 11 women who are being dragged in here kicking and screaming who want rest and repose, to put this behind them.

Ms. Glavin said in her statement something to the effect of well, if Ms. Boylan had sued the Governor, then we would be entitled to these 15 subpoenas or I don't -- I've lost count, actually, because there are others that we don't even know about. That might be right. But she didn't.

She decided -- she made allegations. It had, of course, a domino effect, and we all know what happened, and she was dragged through the mud. Her name -- I mean, even up to this day in this courtroom in the papers she's labeled a bully, a liar, an adulterer. She wants to be done with it. So if there are accommodations and agreements that the parties could make, I couldn't agree with Your Honor more. I think

Proceedings

that would be very welcome by all the victims, including my client.

I know I went a little farther outside of what Your Honor asked and it will go to the ultimate questions in our motion to quash.

But -- so with respect -- I just want to get to the last component of the very narrow question Your Honor just posed to each of the complainants. I actually don't know exactly what the AG's Office has, what these interview memos and the like are, so it's hard for me to say, and I suppose, you know, we can meet and confer again and see if there's any sense or understanding.

THE COURT: The interview memos are sort of a third tier of discovery from the Attorney General's Office, that there will be any from the Attorney General's.

The first question is the unredacted transcript. Do you object to the release of the unredacted transcript?

Obviously, personal identifying would still remain redacted.

But to the extent there are redactions of other witness' names, specific things -- I mean, I do understand what Ms.

Glavin is saying. Occasionally, it is hard to follow the transcript. But by and large, they're not that heavily redacted, in my view.

So the first question is transcript.

MS. PERRY: We would certainly be willing to

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

consider that. I can't say standing on my feet right now,
because I would have to consult with my client, I have to look
at the specific redactions. But that's certainly something we
would be willing to consider.

Just to be very clear, Ms. Boylan stands by all of her allegations. She's not embarrassed by her allegations. She's not worried that she's going to be made to look a liar for having accused the Former Governor of harassment because he did that. So I think I would be very open to that discussion, but I'm not in a position where I can commit to that right here right now.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GLAVIN: Your Honor, if I might be heard on a couple of the points with the subpoena.

THE COURT: What about them?

MR. PARK: With respect to the subpoenas, I just want the Court to be aware.

THE COURT: Which subpoenas?

MR. PARK: The subpoena Ms. Perry referred to, Ms. Boylan's college intern.

The subpoena was to Ms. Boylan's campaign director of media relations. And the reason we subpoenaed her is that Ms. Boylan would dictate messages to this woman, I think her name is Stephanie Parish, which that woman then communicated to other complainants in the case. We have several examples

of that.

The reason we subpoenaed her is because we were not getting -- Ms. Boylan was refusing to produce her communications with others, with particular complainants relating to the allegations. And we knew from production by another party that there were these messages. I think the director of media relations had access to Ms. Boylan's Twitter account and she would communicate with others on it. So you would have a hi, it's Steph, here's a message from Lindsey, boom, and there would be, you know, things she wanted, you know, this person to know. That's why we subpoenaed that particular person. It was once we saw that in documents we got from others, we subpoenaed her, because we wanted to get to those communications.

THE COURT: And you subpoenaed that person for communications?

MS. GLAVIN: I actually can't even remember what the subpoena was, but it was for documents.

And then with respect to Ms. Boylan, I want the record to be clear, she's not a victim of sexual harassment.

The Governor --

THE COURT: We're not trying the case today, Ms. Glavin.

MS. GLAVIN: But given the statement that was made, I have to make clear what the Governor's position is, is that

Proceedings

he never sexually harassed Lindsey Boylan, and that is one of the reasons that we need to get discovery.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. PERRY: Your Honor, I never said -- I know this is a bit of a sideshow at this point.

The, quote/unquote, director of media relations was a college intern. And they're saying they had to subpoen her because Ms. Boylan wouldn't produce. That is the subject of this motion.

We did ask -- with respect to once we got wind that they were continuing to issue this battery of subpoenas, we asked the Court to direct the defendants to stop essentially issuing or, at least, did not seek enforcement, and they've just continued to do it.

So even though a resolution of these issues would put to bed, you know, the scope of what they can do, they're just continuing. So hopefully we will be able to resolve them and the barrage will stop.

THE COURT: Well, the challenge that the Court has, which I'm glad you see perhaps more clearly today based on the conference with both sides, is that to the extent Ms. Boylan will be called as a witness, if there's any truth to the notion that she's involved in discussing with other complainants what to say or discussions of the investigation with other complainants, those will be ripe areas for

Proceedings 66 1 cross-examination. 2 MS. PERRY: Well, I do take issue with that and --3 THE COURT: I don't think that's disproportionate. 4 MS. PERRY: Did Your Honor want to take that up now or do you --5 6 THE COURT: Please. You're here. 7 MS. PERRY: So, again, we had agreed to some limited 8 production that would go directly to Ms. Boylan's allegations. 9 So I do think if they were willing to accept that and walk 10 away from those other categories that we have argued over and 11 over and strenuously as possible, that they are not 12 appropriate and they are disproportionate, then I think we can 13 have a conversation. But the levels to which they're going to 14 impeach a non-party, has been found over and over in this 15 district to be too far. She's a nonparty. 16 THE COURT: This isn't just average impeachment of a 17 person who is like a bystander. 18 Mr. Licul is seeking to use these other victims and 19 complainants, as they are characterized in the papers, to 20 establish this hostile culture around Governor Cuomo. That's 21 not a sort of minor third-party witness. 22 MS. PERRY: But our point is that they then don't 23 have the right -- if Mr. Licul is going to press forward with 24 that theory, then they can cross-examine her about her 25 allegations and the voluminous public record that they have

and what she's willing to produce.

Do they get to ask about her sexual history and about the reasons -- you know, about complaints that may have been made about her allegedly at her place of work? We think that is too far. So there are separate categories. You know, we can go through them. We have tried to do that in our papers.

THE COURT: You have your papers on those issues, for sure.

The challenge, again, is to the extent that the argument is that she has taken the public position that she left due to the harassment and that's not true. Some of these other categories are blurring into potential relevance for impeachment purposes, aren't they?

MS. PERRY: I agree. I mean, there has been discussions about boundaries here. They are boiling the ocean. They are looking under every rock, and that is not allowed under the law. There is not precedent for what they are doing here. She is not a party. She's not a plaintiff here. So, Ms. Glavin's statement, well, if she were, we could do this, is not apropos here. So what are the boundaries obviously is the challenge for Your Honor, that is in front of Your Honor.

I think they could ask about that and they could seek documents that go directly to that. But subpoening all

Proceedings 68 these additional third-parties for that really tests the 1 2 limits of what's allowed or goes well beyond those limits. 3 THE COURT: Fair enough. I understand your 4 argument. 5 I see Mr. Amer has arrived hopeful that his 6 conference will start at noon. It will not, Mr. Amer. 7 MR. AMER: I've been so advised. 8 THE COURT: Ms. Glavin, one minute, and then I want 9 to go to Mr. Capezza, Ms. Cohen and the other --10 MS. GLAVIN: Sure. One other point that I forgot to raise with Your 11 12 Honor with respect to Ms. Boylan, what we are interested in is 13 exploring the relationship with her superior at the Empire 14 State Development Corporation and we want that for three 15 One is it goes to the circumstances of her leaving reasons: 16 her employment, because they were both brought in and 17 counseled on it. 18 The second reason that it becomes relevant is 19 because when Lindsey Boylan went public with her allegations, 20 including one about claiming falsely that the Governor asked 21 her to play strip poker on an airplane and there were three or 22 four other people present, Howard Zemsky was on some flights 23 where Ms. Boylan may have been on, Howard Zemsky signed on to

25 Boylan said.

24

a public statement in February of 2021 disputing what Ms.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

The same day that that public statement went out, Ms. Boylan, who had been in a sexual relationship with Mr. Zemsky, sent him a text message on a self-deleting application called Confide, where she said to him, I can't wait to destroy your life, you shit-follower. She made that relationship relevant because she was threatening him as her allegations were becoming public, when she was asking for an investigation for not backing her up. She threatened a witness in the case. And he's not the only witnessed that she threatened. There were several others.

And one of the reasons why we need to explore these is it goes to Lindsey Boylan's motive and intent in making being the allegations.

Mr. Zemsky, after he got that threat, said oh, maybe I heard something on the plane. And the funny part about it was Lindsey Boylan said she didn't even think he was on the plane.

THE COURT: Ms. Glavin, now I have to give Ms. Perry one more minute, and then Ms. Perry, and then that is it on this issue.

MS. PERRY: I think Ms. Glavin has proven my point. She is going down a rabbit hole trying to re-litigate -essentially to litigate these issues, but my client is not a party and doesn't have to litigate whether or not she had this alleged sexual relationship with Howard Zemsky. How does that

1 | relate to the issues of whether or not Trooper 1 --

THE COURT: The more concerning question is whether or not she threatened a witness, with all due respect, Ms.

Perry. Can you address that?

MS. PERRY: Of course our position is that she didn't. But this really -- again, we are talking about, you know, if all of this is allowed in, if there are no limits and if the parties cannot follow Your Honor's, you know, suggestion, I'll call it, you know, that they try and set some, then we go down this hole, you know -- I mean, I don't know how many rabbit holes we're going to have to go down, because every single witness is going to have to fight tooth and nail about motivations, bias, impeachment.

As Your Honor noted, you know, college records are being sought, my client's phone records, which are different than the phone records that have been discussed, because they have nothing to do, you know, with anything other than they just want to know who she's talking to and when. That is just way too far.

Our main argument, we don't think this is relevant. We've made that very clear. But this is so disproportionate. And, then, of course, we have talked about the burden and harassment, you know, all those other considerations under Rule 45. But under Rule 26, it was not relevant, and Mr. Cuomo's counsel has said that. They don't think any of these

Proceedings 71 1 allegations are relevant. They're trying to, you know, turn 2 all of this whole process on its head. And so that's the 3 issue. THE COURT: They would like them to be precluded, 4 but because of the plaintiff's determination of how to plead 5 this case and Mr. Licul's presentation this morning, I think 6 7 it's very clear to you why they are seeking discovery. 8 (Continued on next page.) 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

ngs 72

(Continuing.)

MS. PERRY: I do understand and that's the problem. And, you know, we have had conversations with Mr. Licul about that. We understand, you know, maybe there will be conversations between the parties, maybe there can be some narrowing. But we certainly understand that for now, all of this, as much as it may hurt all of these complainants is being kept in the case.

And so, we do still think a lot of it is not relevant to Trooper 1 proving her allegation. My client never met her, never talked to her, does not even know her identity. So how she can, she who worked in a very different workplace, you know, could possibly -- her allegations could really speak to Trooper 1's allegations are beyond me.

But again, Your Honor, the proportionality one where if the parties cannot agree on what the limits are, we would ask that extremely reasonable ones that does not, you know, put my client back in this very, very dark place that she had to live in when she was being dragged through the mud the first time around.

THE COURT: I appreciate your comments. Thank you.

All right, Mr. Capezza. Thank you.

MR. CAPEZZA: Your Honor, thank you for the opportunity to address the Court. I represent State Entity Employee Number 2.

Proceedings

To get very clear to the point, she wants nothing to do with this, never asked for this, never asked to be included in a Complaint.

She served her state in the Department of Health during the pandemic. In and of itself, that would be an exhausting experience. When you couple that with the allegations that are memorialized in 200 pages of testimony that's publicly available, the experience for her was traumatizing.

She left public service to go home, frankly, to heal, and she wants no part of this to be brought in.

That said, to the extent that the Court wants to know if we would agree to release the transcript unredacted, we will, provided that it doesn't get into any personal information about her, her family, or her friends. Having sat through that interview, I don't believe much has been redacted, maybe just for personal references only.

It's important to note she's not only not party in this case, she's not a party in any case. She never sued. She never brought suit. She has no factual overlap with any of the other victims as they relate to their victim experiences. She has no factual overlap with any of the allegations as they relate to Trooper 1, doesn't know Trooper 1. She's a standalone who worked in the Department of Health, had an experience with the Governor on one day during

a press conference, before and during that press conference. That's what she testified to. And the Court -- if the Court wants to release the unredacted report, I'm fine with that, provided it doesn't make reference to conversations with her husband or her friends, the personal aspects of which have nothing to do with the events of Trooper 1.

We provided no documents to the parties because, frankly, we weren't asked for documents. And I hesitate to say that because I don't want to be served with a subpoena for documents, but the fact is that she was served with two subpoenas and to use the word retraumatized, that's exactly what it is.

She went back. She went home. She went home to heal. And for the last few years everything was fine, but then all of a sudden this starts up. And she didn't ask to be included in that Complaint. She's named in one paragraph in that Complaint, nothing else. It seems to memorialize what's already been said by way of her public testimony.

She has nothing to add to Trooper 1. She doesn't know Trooper 1. She doesn't know any of the other victims or their experiences. And so to be dragged into this is not proportional to anything and it retraumatizes her.

If there are any other questions the Court has, I am happy to answer them.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. I appreciate your

remarks.

Ms. Cohen, would you like to be heard on behalf of Ms. Hinton?

MS. COHEN: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

So, Ms. Hinton, unlike some of the other complainants, did not -- was not in the work environment for the State. She was not in the perimeter around the Governor in the workplace. She worked for the Governor thirty years ago when he was at HUD. She was subpoenaed for documents and testimony related to, purportedly, her support of other women who came forward with what they endured, in terms of sexual harassment by defendant Cuomo. She was publicly outspoken in her support of those women. She came forward publicly and there was a newspaper article in The Washington Post that she had been touched by defendant Cuomo when she worked for him thirty years ago in the federal government.

But as to Trooper 1's allegations, she doesn't know
Trooper 1. She doesn't know anything about the facts or
circumstances surrounding those allegations. She never met
Trooper 1. She never communicated to Trooper 1.

Nevertheless, Ms. Hinton did comply with the document subpoena on her, at least in relevant part, in that we have produced about a hundred pages of documents to defendant Cuomo, which we understand has been shared with the other defendants in this case.

Proceedings

She produced 50 pages of documents related to Ms. Boylan, which consists primarily of texts and words of support about Ms. Boylan's allegations, as well as help that Ms. Hinton provided to Ms. Boylan in her job search because she was unable to get any employment after she came forth publicly.

Ms. Hinton produced more than thirty pages of documents related to Ms. Bennett. Again, words of encouragement to Ms. Bennett when Ms. Bennett came forward with her allegations against defendant Cuomo, and also helped with Ms. Bennett's job search.

A few pages of communications with Ms. Liss of the same nature, and she produced calendar entries showing her appointment to speak with investigators for the Attorney General's report.

There are no other documents that are even arguably relevant. Nevertheless, the subpoena had called for all documents related to Ms. Hinton's conversation with the press, all documents related to drafts of a book she wrote, and other documents that have no relevance to the purported reason for the subpoena, which is to the extent the three complainants, Ms. Boylan, Ms. Bennett and Ms. Liss, spoke to Ms. Hinton about their allegations and said something different to Ms. Hinton than that they would -- what they would testify about in the hypothetical situation where they were allowed to

be called as witnesses in Trooper 1's trial, that then Ms. Hinton could be called as a witness to impeach the credibility of those two women.

Ms. Hinton is a nonparty here. There is really nothing more Ms. Hinton can provide. We tried to be -- we tried to provide the documents we thought were tangentially and arguably relevant. We produced those. Those documents were way beyond what was produced to the Attorney General's office.

I did not represent Ms. Hinton when she went and spoke with the investigator with the Attorney General's office. I don't believe she produced any documents to the Attorney General, but if there are such documents, I, at least, have not seen them and Ms. Hinton no longer possesses them.

To answer Your Honor's questions, we have nothing more that we are willing to produce as even potentially relevant to this litigation.

We were also subpoenaed for a deposition, which given the review of the documents we did produce, there is absolutely no relevance and no reason to be taking Ms. Hinton's deposition, other than to continue to harass Ms. Hinton who has been a publicly outspoken supporter of women who have come forward with Mr. Cuomo's behavior toward them, as well as the incident that she has publicly disclosed

against her that occurred, again, thirty years ago.

To the last part of Your Honor's question, would we agree to the public release of whatever information Ms. Hinton provided to the Attorney General, as well as how an unredacted or less redacted portion of her interview with the Attorney General's office, subject to discussing it with my client and being able to review it myself, we would consider that.

I would also say that as to the witnesses named in the 26(a) disclosure, Ms. Hinton is not individually one of those witnesses. She is only there by -- her name is not there in the 26(a) disclosures, other than number 18, which the plaintiff referred to all witnesses named or interviewed by the Attorney General, and Ms. Hinton was interviewed by the Attorney General.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Ms. Cohen.

MS. COHEN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Wang, would you like to be hard?

MS. WANG: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

As I said earlier, I represent Ms. Virginia Limmiatis and Alyssa McGrath.

Ms. Limmiatis had a single incident of harassment by then Governor Cuomo in May 2017. Ms. McGrath worked actually for the executive office, but the then Governor pulled her and others in because of what they looked like and because they're women to work closely with him, and in that regard between

2018 and approximately early 2020 experienced some of the sexual harassment that has been written about and is documented in the AG report.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Both are full-time working individuals. One is a single mother of a small child. They have not brought lawsuits. They are not parties to any lawsuits. They are nonparties with few resources and very limited time. Both testified in the AG matter, and their depositions are actually in the public domain on the public website of the AG.

We have tried to work with defendants and we received first document and deposition subpoenas, I believe back in April, and we produced hundreds of pages of documents. We produced everything that we gave to the AG. And I believe we gave a bit more than that, in fact. And to the extent that there was more being sought, we have tried to confer repeatedly with defense counsel on those issues. Specifically, with respect to the lack of boundaries that are being drawn, the types of requests that are being asked, which we're always being told is relevant, but then when we ask why it's relevant, ti's simply, the answer is: Well, you were in the Complaint, that's why it's relevant. For example, all -any and all communications ever about any allegation against the Governor or anything about the AG has to be produced, which would mean looking through thousands of texts for amorphous and unclear terms to see whether somebody sought out

Virginia Limmiatis and expressed support for her. You know, anything at all about these allegations.

I just want to point out that at some point in the summer of 2021, Ms. Glavin held press conferences speaking at length disparaging both of my clients. Ms. Limmiatis, showing pictures of Ms. Limmiatis smiling or discussing Ms. McGrath and her then ex-husband or her soon-to-be ex-husband. They were in the middle of a divorce. Ms. Glavin held press conferences disparaging my clients.

So, in theory, I believe what defendants would be seeking is if somebody sent a text to Ms. Limmiatis saying:

Do you see what they're doing to you? And she said: Oh, my God. We would have to go and look for those texts, presumably, and produce them. Those are the types of things that they're asking for. They want us to look through all of their texts for anything regarding Mr. Cuomo or the AG, regardless of whether it has anything to do with their credibility or not, and there is no limitation on that at all.

We don't -- we didn't have a problem producing those documents and even looking in the limited fashion for additional documents, but that's not -- there's been no limit to additional requests on documents for Ms. Limmiatis or Ms. McGrath. And, in fact, after having two meet-and-confers with defense counsel, they've even gone backwards on some of the limitations. In the first meet-and-confer in July, there

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

81

seemed to be an indication that they really just wanted substantive conversations about the allegations. Later on, they said that no, we want everything, any -- any communication, even if some stranger or a fourth grade -- a fourth-grade classmate said Thank you for coming forward, we -- we want you to look for those and find out if they're -- if they're substantive.

That's just not proportionate to a nonparty. We shouldn't have to look through thousands of texts.

Ms. Glavin has said that Ms. McGrath is in a different place because her position in the Governor's office at some point was in a position of being able to see more of the working environment, which is true. But, for instance, in that scenario, what the -- what the discovery that's being sought from Ms. McGrath is really about Ms. Commisso, who is another nonparty, Brittany Commisso. Brittany Commisso and Alyssa McGrath were extraordinarily close friends who talked about everything all the time, and very little about the Governor, in fact; much more just about being best friends. And in this -- because of their relationship, Ms. Glavin is now seeking things like all photographs that Ms. McGrath took of her birthday party on March 6th, 2021, because, apparently, the birthday photos of Ms. McGrath are relevant to see, I don't know what. Nothing happened there about -- allegedly, Ms. Commisso may have spoken to somebody about what Mr. Cuomo

did to her when she was away from the party, but Ms. Glavin wants every photo from that evening.

This is -- this is the definition of a fishing expedition and of harassment. It has nothing to do with Trooper 1 at this point. It doesn't even, in my view, have anything to do with credibility of Ms. McGrath. It is just harassing a nonparty, who is a working single mom, who is trying to get on with her life and not to have to think about the defendant anymore.

With respect to your specific questions, I believe there wouldn't be a problem with respect to redactions. I would just ask the same courtesy as everyone else, which is I just need to be reminded of what they are before I agree and to talk to my client. But I don't think there would be any problem with that.

And I presume they would be subject to the protective order in this case, to the extent there's any private issue or private information.

I do want to just add one other thing with respect to the depositions.

Ms. Glavin indicated that she would depose -- she would agree to depose Ms. Limmiatis for, quote, only four hours, but that Ms. McGrath has to be the full seven hours. And that Ms. Limmiatis could be done by Zoom, but Ms. McGrath has to be done in person.

Once again, even for -- even for Ms. Limmiatis to be subjected to four hours of deposition testimony for a single incident from May 2017 is not reasonable. I mean there's plenty of caselaw, you know, indicating that proportionality for a single incident in 2017, that shouldn't even be four hours. But then on top of it, if you're willing to take her deposition in a limited fashion by Zoom, why can't you take another -- the other nonparty's witness testimony by Zoom and why can't you also, likewise, limit it, limit it to a specific number of hours. It's just, it's just too much.

And then on top of it, after all of these meet-and-confers, we have then gotten more deposition -- more subpoenas from the other nonparties. So, which we have just received and we have to start looking at as well.

So, we ask that Your Honor please place limits on this, on this fishing expedition really.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Appreciate that, thank you very much.

Mr. Eisenberg on behalf of Ms. Bennett.

Do you represent her in the Southern District case as well, sir?

MR. EISENBERG: Yes, we do.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

A couple of questions for you that are different than the other parties, given that there is an S.D.N.Y. case

pending as to her.

What is your view on the question that I raised prior to defendants as to whether or not the discovery disputes pertaining to Ms. Bennett could be sort of resolved in the Southern District case?

Do we need to resolve them separately here?

And also, is there a protective order in that case or can the information be used in both cases?

What is the State of play, from your perspective, on behalf of Ms. Bennett with regard to those questions?

MR. EISENBERG: First, let me thank the Court for its sensitivity to the potential conflicting rulings in both matters.

There is presently a protective order in place that is being renegotiated. We actually have a meet-and-confer this Thursday regarding some of the alterations or edits to the protective order.

As far as whether that protective order would adhere to what happens in this court, I can't tell this Court what to do, but it is imperative that my client's confidentiality and designated confidential documentation be maintained. And we would ask that the protective order that we eventually enter into, in addition to the one that's already so ordered by Judge Broderick, be adhered to.

With regard to the discovery disputes, our case

isn't as old as this one. So, we are earlier in the process, though, we are -- we have served discovery and we have received discovery requests. We have filed or tendered objections from both sides. We are in the process of trying to get documents served and move things along.

And I, too, have not yelled at Ms. Glavin.

And, you know, we're just trying to make the things work. We are particularly concerned that doing discovery in this Trooper 1 matter will have an adverse impact on our ability to do things smoothly, efficiently, in our own case. And we would ask the sensitivity to potential conflicting rulings be maintained.

With regard to the status of the protective order here and any documentation that is tendered, I have not honestly seen the protective order here, but we are concerned about the use of documents in this case.

Surely, we will be eminently reasonable if things make sense to be utilized in this case by either Ms. Glavin or Governor Cuomo's counsel and Trooper 1's counsel. We will work with them to make things work, but there are certain things in this case that make no sense to us.

Like many of the others, my client doesn't know

Trooper 1, didn't interact with Trooper 1, didn't observe any
of the allegations with regard to Trooper 1. And in her
listing of witnesses with information, it is notable that her

information is specifically related to her experiences, not Trooper 1's.

With regard to the -- Mr. Licul made some reference as to why Ms. DeRosa and Ms. Bennett -- other parties are named as parties here. My client has nothing whatsoever to do with them, and she shouldn't be burdened with a deposition and document requests by Ms. DeRosa and Mr. Azzopardi's counsel.

When asked: Aren't you going to depose her? As Ms. DeRosa is a named defendant in our Southern District case, the response was: I'm not her counsel in that case. But it is not counsel that governs, it is the client. And, of course, Ms. DeRosa will depose Ms. Bennett in our Southern District case, as we will depose Ms. DeRosa.

With regard to the Hamilton College frolic and detour. We feel strongly that that is nothing but a frolic and detour. It really is inapposite, certainly has no role whatsoever in Trooper 1's case. We think it has limited role in our own case. We are in the process of trying to work out parameters of a protective order that would govern the receipt of documentation that is provided by Hamilton College, if any. And that is something that is on the table. As I said, we'll be speaking about that later this week. We think Hamilton College has no role whatsoever to play in the case in the Eastern District.

THE COURT: So --

MR. EISENBERG: If the Court has any other questions, I'm happy to answer them.

THE COURT: So, the questions I had for all include your position on disclosure of unredacted transcripts from the AG's Office and/or interview memos and notes. Not previewing any ruling, Mr. Eisenberg, I just asked everybody that question to set the table for your conference.

MR. EISENBERG: With regard to the unredacted testimony, I don't think we have a problem with it. I'd love to see it before we agree.

With regard to interview notes, similarly an opportunity to review those documents would inform our ability to answer the question certainly speaking to our client would do so as well.

In principle, I don't think we have a problem with it, presuming that these items are, again, subject to a protective order. We are concerned that our client will be publicly shamed and -- and her allegations will be discredited in press conferences, as they have been previously, we want to minimize the harm to her.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MR. EISENBERG: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Najmi.

MR. NAJMI: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Your Honor.

I represent Alessandra Biaggi, who, as you know,

SAN, OCK RMK CRK RPR

Your Honor, was a state senator from 2019 to 2022.

She received a subpoena from Governor Cuomo's attorneys. And what's interesting is my client is separate and apart from -- can be distinguished from all the other third-party -- the nonparty witnesses, in that she's never made an allegation of sexual harassment against the Governor. She stated that publicly. And she's not mentioned in the plaintiff's Complaint at all. And so, there is certainly a glaring relevance issue there that -- with respect to the subpoena on Ms. Biaggi.

We did have two meet-and-confers with defendant Cuomo's counsel. I also did not yell at anybody.

We stated that with respect to the time periods in which she's a senator, you know, if any communications are with respect to the legislative privilege, in that they're communicating to her really because she's a state senator. She is an outspoken advocate for women when she was in the chamber for workplace issues. In fact, after this entire incident with the Governor, she voted on a legislative package that included reforms to workplace harassment issues and -- and workplace issues that came out of this entire thing. And she -- and we are citing that privilege.

We did respond to the subpoena by giving written objections to defendant Cuomo's counsel. And we are citing the legislative privilege for the entire time that she is a

Proceedings

senator. And, Your Honor, with respect to -- you know, so we have not handed over any documents or correspondences.

And with respect to the AG's interview notes -- our client was, in fact, interviewed by the AG -- we would want to review those materials and discuss it with our client.

One of the questions that we had, Your Honor, was, you know, we -- we would anticipate to file a motion to quash. We, obviously, didn't want to do it before this conference. Part of that motion would include relevance arguments that are already the subject, identical arguments that are subject to motions that are already pending before the Court. So we would want to know whether it would be prudent for us to wait until those are resolved. And I did see that other counsel did seek leave from Your Honor to file a motion to quash, but I don't know that that's part of the rules.

THE COURT: So, most people have just been filing motions with no pre-motion conference letter of any kind. And I haven't sort of brought down the hammer on anybody because we are dealing with a lot of third-parties. These issues are fraught.

And I am sensitive to everybody's interest in being heard without requiring third-parties, in particular, to jump through a bunch of procedural hoops. So, to the extent I haven't been like: You did not get permission to file this motion; there are reasons that I have been, basically,

privately waiving my personal rules.

So, with regard to the legislative privilege issues that you mentioned, Mr. Najmi, as I am sure you are aware, the Court previously had an occasion to address legislative privilege in this very case. And, of course, the legislative privilege is not an absolute privilege as interpreted in the federal courts for state legislators.

So, to the extent your position is that some of the messages or reach out that she received from persons who felt affected by the Governor's actions was part of her information gathering in furtherance of legislative efforts, I understand there may well be a privilege that attaches.

If, however, she's also engaged in constituent services discussing what happened with people in a more constituent-related capacity, it may not be covered.

And this is going to be a very fact, it would be a very fact-intensive analysis potentially. So, if you are asserting legislative privilege, you will, of course, need to provide a detailed privilege log --

MR. NAJMI: Yes.

THE COURT: -- not a categorical one --

MR. NAJMI: Okay.

THE COURT: -- to Governor Cuomo's people in an effort to meet and confer and meaningfully narrow those issues.

Proceedings

You guys have small benefit, in that I previously had to review the legislative privileges of applicability in this very case, but the Assembly Judiciary Committee is very differently situated than an individual legislator in terms of what they were seeking in the context of that subpoena being very different than an individual legislator's actions that may or may not be covered in full.

So, a detailed non-categorical privileged log would need to be prepared. And I don't want to volunteer it because I want the parties to try to work it out as much as possible, but it could come to privilege review, which is, of course, a very, very cumbersome and slow process that, again, no one wants to deal with.

So, I encourage you to meet-and-confer -- and I am stressing this to Governor Cuomo's people as well -- be reasonable in terms of what you are seeking from Ms. Biaggi. If she is, in fact, gathering information in furtherance of legislation, you know what the outcome is going to be and you can save yourselves hundreds of pages of briefing.

MS. GLAVIN: Yes.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. GLAVIN: Judge, just on that one point.

One thing that I do think is relevant is that

Ms. Biaggi worked in the executive chamber for Governor Cuomo
in 2019. And that is the reason that the Attorney General's

office interviewed her to discuss her experience there. And she also overlapped and worked during the same time as Kaitlin, whose last name I am not allowed to use. I object to that. As well as Lindsey Boylan. And they contacted, as we understand it, Ms. Biaggi to talk with her about her experiences and whether she'd come forward.

And, in fact, Ms. Biaggi gave an interview to a publication in which Ms. Boylan and Kaitlin also gave interviews. And so, to the extent she knows them, was communicating with them about their experiences, which has nothing to do, to the extent she worked with them and was discussing with them coming forward and herself coming forward, she was interviewed not as a legislator, but as a witness.

THE COURT: I understand.

So, Mr. Najmi, additional points for your discussion with Governor Cuomo in terms of the meet-and-confer.

If she was, in fact, having discussions with regard to positioning for press purposes, how to present information in a way that could be, I am just taking Devil's advocate here, detrimental to Governor Cuomo and is counseling -- they are counseling each other on what they are going to say, it could be that that information is arguably relevant. It might be disproportionate -- and I am looking at you, Ms. Glavin -- but it certainly may be relevant.

So, please, be very granular in your analysis of what information Ms. Biaggi may have in your conversation with Mr. Cuomo.

MR. NAJMI: Your Honor, I just have one correction.

She worked in the, Ms. Biaggi worked in the executive chamber not in 2019. She was a state senator in 2019.

MS. GLAVIN: 2017.

MR. NAJMI: She worked in 2017 up until middle of 2018 before she left to run her campaign.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. NAJMI: I understand everything you said, Your Honor, and we will confer further with defendant's counsel.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

All right, and I believe we have Ms. Salzman as well.

MS. SALZMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Thank you, Your Honor. As mentioned, we represent nonparty Kaitlin. And Kaitlin is also not a plaintiff in this or in any case. She also chose not to sue.

She worked in the executive chamber for one year from 2017 to early 2018. During that period of time Trooper 1, it is our understanding, was not employed in the PSU. Certainly, Kaitlin did not know Trooper 1, has never communicated with her and has never communicated about her.

Proceedings

In 2018 Kaitlin left the executive chamber. Over three years later, in 2021, she was subpoenaed by the Attorney General to provide documents relevant to their investigation into the now former Governor. She complied. We produced almost 250 pages of documents to the Attorney General.

And to answer your first question, Your Honor, every single one of those pages has been turned over to the defense in this case for many months now.

Two-and-a-half years later, now, in 2023, the defense has subpoenaed her in this case. There is no allegation by the Attorney General's office, or by the defendants in this case, that Kaitlin's production to the Office of the Attorney General was in any way incomplete. I heard some specific examples from Ms. Glavin today about other nonparties, that their production to the OAG had gaps or holes in it.

I have asked Ms. Glavin repeatedly: Are you saying that Kaitlin's production to the AG, and now to you, is incomplete in some way? Point me to those gaps. Maybe we can fill them. That is what a meet-and-confer is supposed to be about. Not a single gap or hole was identified.

Instead, what Ms. Glavin told me they were focused on was: What happened after your production to the AG's Office in May 2021? Were there documents that post date May 2021, which Kaitlin received or exchanged with others that

might be relevant to the Trooper 1 case?

Okay. That, again, is something I think we can meet-and-confer about. And we did meet-and-confer with them, Your Honor. I had the same thinking that Your Honor suggested, let's start with the OAG production and then point me, Defense Counsel, to some specific examples of what else Kaitlin might have that would be relevant and proportionate to the Trooper 1 case.

But again and again, over the course of more than half a dozen meet-and-confers, Your Honor, for a nonparty who does not have any resources to be engaged in this process, again and again I was met with defense counsel saying things like: You must comply with the subpoena as drafted. Your client has relevant discovery to the claims and allegations in this case. Boilerplate, in other words.

Finally, in August, in our penultimate meet-and-confer with Ms. Glavin, she said: Well, what we're really interested in is communications between Kaitlin and the other AG complainants after May 2021.

Finally, I said, this is something concrete we can go and look for.

Like Ms. Wang explained, my client, because she was named in the OAG report, received a lot of text messages and outreach from friends and family when that report became public and garnered a lot of public attention of people

Proceedings

reaching out to her like: Oh, my God, I'm so sad to hear what happened to you. Are you okay? How are you coping? How have things been?

Trolling through all of that is incredibly burdensome and disproportionate to the needs of the case. And Ms. Glavin acknowledged that. She said: We don't want that kind of communication, we want communications between Kaitlin and Lindsey Boylan, Charlotte Bennett, and the other complainants in the AG report.

The very same day I responded to Ms. Glavin that Kaitlin has no such communications after May 2021, except some text messages with Lindsey Boylan. And I am aware from the docket in this case that Ms. Boylan has made a motion to quash and it was already pending in August.

So I said to Ms. Glavin: I can't backdoor around a pending motion to quash and a forthcoming ruling from the Court. If Your Honor says Ms. Boylan's motion to quash is granted, you can't get those communications from Kaitlin. If Your Honor says that the motion to quash is denied and those communications are discoverable, we will produce them.

But beyond communications with other AG complainants, the defense in this case has never been able to identify with any granularity, with any specificity, what else they could possibly want from Kaitlin. And that continues to this very day. And each time we tried to use a

meet-and-confer to narrow the scope of the subpoena, to understand what they were really looking for, to try to address it, they would renege on what they said in the meet-and-confer.

So, Ms. Glavin wrote me an e-mail on August 17th.

She wrote it to me saying: What we want before your client's deposition are her communications with the other complainants.

Once I said: We have nothing, except these messages with Ms. Boylan, suddenly that was no longer the agreement, they wanted more. But, again, no specificity as to what.

So what have we given? Everything we gave the AG.

What are would he prepared to give? What they've asked for. Communications with the other complainants that we have, which is only Ms. Boylan, once the Court has ruled on Ms. Boylan's motion to quash. We have nothing else that is relevant, much less proportionate to the allegations in this case.

In terms of Your Honor's -- and I should mention one other thing, Your Honor.

After all these many meet-and-confers with us, I learn on the same day that Ms. Glavin tells me all she wants is communications between us and the other AG complainants, on that same day I learn that she has subpoenaed Verizon for three-and-a-half years of my client's phone records and all her account information. I asked Ms. Glavin in writing, this

Proceedings

is Exhibit 11 to her declaration: How could that possibly be relevant and proportionate to the Trooper 1 case? There's not a single allegation in this case that my client's phone records have anything to do with anything.

She said, boilerplate again: They're relevant to the claims and allegations in this case.

Not once in over half a dozen meet-and-confers did the defense in this case tell me: We need phone records because there was this call made on this date and we're entitled to know if it happened or not. Right. Had that happened, we could have taken that under advisement, gone and looked at the phone records, produced some redacted phone records if that was truly an issue in this case. They never mentioned phone records to me once, much less given me an opportunity to consider are there actually phone records we have that might be relevant and proportionate to this case.

So, again, that subpoena, Your Honor, three-and-a-half years of a nonparty's cell phone records when they can't tell me a single phone call is relevant and proportionate to there case, it's been unlike any meet-and-confer process I have ever seen, as a plaintiff, as a defendant or as a nonparty.

So, that subpoena, in our view, Your Honor, should be quashed. And that is the subject of motion practice that is going on now between us and Governor Cuomo, and we are sort

of in the midst of that briefing.

In terms of Your Honor's question about releasing the OAG interview memos. I have not seen those. We do not have them. I don't know what they contain.

In terms of Kaitlin's deposition transcript, which, of course, the Governor has, there the redactions are two kinds, Your Honor.

The first is what Your Honor alluded to, the names of other witnesses. And there we have no objection to removing the redactions from the names of other state employees. I don't represent those employees. I don't represent the Office of the Attorney General. They may have a different view, but from our perspective that's not the sensitive or confidential matter for Kaitlin.

What is confidential, however, are the other set of redactions in the AG's deposition. And those consist of redactions to Kaitlin's full name, which we have never made public. The only person who has ever publicized that is defendant Cuomo, himself.

And second, other personal information about her.

Her work history before she worked for Governor Cuomo; a

personal matter between her and a romantic partner in her past
that came up when she was asked to explain what she thought
sexual harassment was; things like that, which are extremely
personal, extremely sensitive, and have no relevance to a

hostile work environment while working for Governor Cuomo.

2 Those redactions we do believe should remain in place. And we

3 | would certainly want the protections of the confidentiality

4 order in this case to remain in place and continue to protect

5 Kaitlin's name, unless and until the defense makes a motion,

as they are entitled to do, under the confidentiality order,

7 to lift that designation. In which case, we'll respond. And

8 | we can tee that issue up for Your Honor. But as of now, her

name and her identifying information is confidential under the

confidentiality order.

1

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Agreed.

So, thank you for that.

MS. GLAVIN: May I just be heard briefly?

THE COURT: Ms. Glavin, it is 12:30. Mr. Amer is here. I do not have the bulk of the afternoon available for this case. So, I do need to turn to some other matters.

How much time are you seeking?

MS. GLAVIN: One minute.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. GLAVIN: Your Honor, with respect to Kaitlin's counsel's recitation of the meet-and-confers, I couldn't disagree more about what happened. We have our reply papers due on the motion, and we will layout the recitation. For each of those calls, I had witnesses on those calls. We couldn't even get them to agree to provide to us what they

	Proceedings 101		
1	produced to the AG.		
2	With respect		
3	THE COURT: Are you saying you don't have it?		
4	MS. GLAVIN: We now do. But after the first two		
5	meet-and-confers, no, they wouldn't even give		
6	THE COURT: But you now have what was produced to		
7	the AG?		
8	MS. GLAVIN: To the AG.		
9	Secondly, with respect to the claim that there was		
10	any reneging, there wasn't. Kaitlin's deposition was coming		
11	up and we had no documents. And so what I asked was: Let's		
12	start with this, can you please produce, at least, what the		
13	communications were with complainants? And we can revisit the		
14	stuff at a later date. Because we wanted to get something		
15	before that deposition because we had no documents.		
16	We tried to be reasonable throughout this. When we		
17	asked, we were repeatedly asked by Kaitlin's counsel: Well,		
18	tell me what's relevant.		
19	And we're like: Do you have responsive documents?		
20	Have you talked to your client about who she may have had		
21	discussions with? And let's start from there.		
22	We couldn't even get that.		
23	But that will be in my papers. But I don't want the		
24	Court to think we went into these meet-and-confers and at		
25	every point it was: Why am I producing this?		

And we would keep asking: Well, what do you have?

And then let's work from there.

It will be in my papers.

THE COURT: This is part of the reason, we were joking about this before, but this is part of the reason motion-to-compel practice is terribly time intensive and burdensome for all.

MS. GLAVIN: Yes.

THE COURT: You guys have starkly different recollections of what happened in these meet-and-confers.

I do not want either of you sitting in the witness box telling me what happened in the meet-and-confer. I do not want to look backward. I want to look forward and I want to find solutions, and I want to find some guide rails because this, as we know, is off the rails.

So --

MS. FOTI: I'm sorry. Can I just say something?

THE COURT: Yes, absolutely, Ms. Foti.

MS. FOTI: The only thing I want to say, Your Honor, is there's been a lot of comments about Governor Cuomo's subpoenas and the discussions between the parties and Governor Cuomo's counsel, which I think indicates that we really are a third wheel. I'm not certain why we're here, but we have been dragged in here.

And I cannot take representations from the various

Proceedings	103
-------------	-----

counsel that they don't have anything to say about my client as a basis to not go forward with their testimony.

I think it's very clear that we still need their testimony if we are continuing to be in the case and if Mr. Licul continues to insist that whatever those other individuals have to say about their hostile work environment somehow implicates Ms. DeRosa and/or Mr. Azzopardi, although I appreciate Mr. Azzopardi is not really part of the case except for a tweet.

And just on that, to correct the record, the tweet Mr. Azzopardi put out was about the Wigdor firm. It was not about the plaintiff, it was about the Wigdor firm, calling them ambulance chasers saying they extorted -- they were extortionists, not about the plaintiff.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

And thank you, Ms. Salzman. I look forward to receiving all of the briefing.

So, obviously, we've been at it for quite a while.

I am assuming that people might need a short break. So, if we could take five and then start the argument involving the Office of Attorney General.

Please reconvene by 12:35.

(Recess taken.)

(Matter adjourned.)

-		
_	23rd [2] - 18:11, 19:1	ABADY [1] - 3:2
1	25 [2] - 16.11, 19.1 25 [7] - 5:17, 9:2, 31:8, 31:9, 31:12,	
4 4.4 4.04 4.5 4.44 4.40 0.45		abetted [2] - 41:23, 46:7
1 [59] - 1:4, 1:24, 4:5, 4:11, 4:13, 6:17,	39:4, 39:8	abetting [1] - 45:20
7:1, 7:3, 7:8, 8:3, 8:7, 8:19, 8:22, 9:11,	250 [2] - 2:21, 94:5	abettor [1] - 45:22
11:9, 17:1, 18:4, 20:12, 20:15, 20:16,	26 [4] - 1:7, 23:4, 60:9, 70:24	abettors [1] - 42:6
21:1, 21:25, 22:3, 22:7, 22:11, 24:15,	26(a [2] - 78:9, 78:11	ability [6] - 16:16, 26:19, 31:21, 34:8,
24:17, 34:24, 35:7, 35:13, 41:9, 45:19,	26(a)1 [2] - 7:14, 10:9	85:10, 87:12
45:23, 46:6, 46:9, 48:15, 70:1, 72:10,	26th [1] - 40:10	able [11] - 18:10, 18:15, 19:17, 24:12,
73:23, 73:24, 74:6, 74:19, 74:20,	2704 [1] - 3:5	28:20, 33:24, 42:11, 65:17, 78:7,
75:18, 75:20, 82:5, 85:9, 85:23, 85:24,	27th [1] - 18:23	81:12, 96:22
93:23, 93:24, 95:1, 95:8, 98:2		Abramowitz [1] - 5:1
1's [16] - 8:1, 8:18, 10:14, 19:13, 20:10,	3	ABRAMOWITZ [1] - 2:11
21:11, 21:16, 21:19, 34:8, 61:6, 72:14,	<u> </u>	absence [1] - 32:9
75:17, 77:1, 85:19, 86:2, 86:17	30 _[1] - 2:18	absolute [1] - 90:6
10 [5] - 18:1, 19:4, 19:16, 19:25, 27:6	32 [1] - 2:24	absolutely [2] - 77:21, 102:18
10-deposition [1] - 16:8	36 [2] - 23:3, 27:2	
10003 [1] - 1:24	JU [2] - 20.0, 21.2	accept [1] - 66:9
	4	access [1] - 64:7
10004 [2] - 2:6, 2:24	4	accident [1] - 14:15
10017 [1] - 2:12	403 to 10:32 12:3 54:0 50:4	accommodation [2] - 15:2, 58:24
10019 [3] - 2:2, 2:21, 3:3	403 [5] - 10:23, 12:3, 51:9, 52:1	accommodations [1] - 61:24
10028 [1] - 2:15	404(b [3] - 10:22, 12:3, 47:23	account [2] - 64:8, 97:25
10279 [1] - 3:6	412 [1] - 13:7	accusation [1] - 24:7
11 [4] - 17:1, 44:23, 61:11, 98:1	45 [1] - 70:24	accused [6] - 8:24, 24:5, 24:6, 45:19,
11201 [1] - 3:11		45:21, 63:8
11:00 [1] - 1:8	5	accusing [2] - 46:5, 48:19
12211 [1] - 2:18		acknowledged [3] - 26:11, 58:21, 96:6
12:00 [2] - 38:1, 38:5	50 [3] - 9:11, 12:9, 76:1	act [1] - 55:14
12:30 [1] - 100:14	50s [1] - 55:19	* *
12:35 [1] - 100:14 12:35 [1] - 103:23	55,000 [1] - 22:14	acted [1] - 34:19
14534 [1] - 2:9	55th [1] - 2:21	acting [1] - 38:7
	565 [1] - 2:12	action [1] - 45:24
15 [2] - 27:6, 61:16	56th [1] - 2:2	actions [2] - 90:10, 91:6
156 [1] - 2:2		actual [1] - 49:4
157 [1] - 2:15	6	add [3] - 17:7, 74:19, 82:19
16th [1] - 10:3		addition [2] - 44:25, 84:23
17th [1] - 97:5	613-2272 [1] - 3:11	additional [13] - 5:9, 13:12, 15:13,
18 [1] - 78:11	6th [1] - 81:22	16:22, 39:1, 40:5, 57:1, 59:8, 60:6,
	VIII [1] - U 1.22	68:1, 80:21, 80:22, 92:16
2	7	address [9] - 5:11, 7:2, 18:7, 21:21,
	7	40:19, 70:4, 72:24, 90:4, 97:3
2 [3] - 2:18, 57:2, 72:25	719 (4) 2:11	addressed [1] - 53:5
20 [2] - 19:25, 27:1	718 [1] - 3:11	addressing [1] - 36:3
200 [1] - 73:7	73 [2] - 18:1, 23:1	adhere [1] - 84:18
2016 [1] - 31:24	75 [1] - 3:2	adhered [1] - 64:16
2017 [6] - 78:22, 83:3, 83:5, 93:8, 93:9,	_	
93:22	8	adjourned [1] - 103:25
2018 [4] - 79:1, 93:10, 93:22, 94:1		administrative [1] - 11:3
	803(8 [4] - 50:3, 51:3, 51:9, 53:14	admissibility [2] - 50:4, 53:8
2019 [4] - 88:1, 91:25, 93:6, 93:7	803(8) [2] - 49:18, 49:24	admissible [1] - 51:23
2020 [1] - 79:1	803(B [1] - 53:19	admission [1] - 50:2
2021 [9] - 9:21, 68:24, 80:4, 81:22, 94:2,	85 [1] - 1:24	admitted [1] - 48:25
94:24, 94:25, 95:19, 96:11	86th [1] - 2:15	admonition [1] - 60:21
2022 [1] - 88:1		adulterer [1] - 61:23
2023 [2] - 1:7, 94:9	9	adverse [2] - 12:10, 85:9
2024 [1] - 40:7	3	advised [1] - 68:7
20th [1] - 3:2	90 [1] - 2:5	advisement [1] - 98:11
22-CV-00893 [1] - 1:4	99 [1] - 2:8	advocacy[2] - 47:11
22-CV-893 [1] - 4:5		advocate [3] - 47:81 advocate [3] - 47:8, 88:17, 92:20
225 [1] - 3:10	Λ	
23-MC-1587 [2] - 1:13, 4:6	Α	advocates [1] - 44:19
233 [1] - 3:5	a m (4) - 1:8	affairs [2] - 21:14, 26:2
200 [1] - 0.0	a.m [1] - 1:8	affected [1] - 90:10

afield [2] - 60:15, 60:18 Alyssa [2] - 78:20, 81:17 assuming [1] - 103:20 afternoon [1] - 100:15 ambulance [1] - 103:13 assure [2] - 36:8, 54:25 **AG** [28] - 14:9, 22:22, 22:24, 23:7, amenable [5] - 40:11, 45:3, 45:11, Atlantic [1] - 9:20 23:10, 23:12, 23:15, 30:22, 31:11, 56:22, 59:1 attaches [1] - 90:12 31:12, 31:14, 43:11, 79:3, 79:8, 79:9, AMER [1] - 68:7 attack [4] - 6:11, 46:17, 55:3 79:13, 79:23, 80:16, 89:4, 94:18, Amer [4] - 53:2, 68:5, 68:6, 100:14 attempt [1] - 6:8 95:19, 96:9, 96:21, 97:11, 97:22, amorphous [1] - 79:25 attempting [1] - 6:10 101:1, 101:7, 101:8 Ana [10] - 25:11, 25:18, 25:20, 32:20, attention [2] - 55:15, 95:25 **AG's** [16] - 7:18, 14:21, 31:4, 37:13, 37:4, 39:11, 55:9, 55:10, 55:11 attorney [1] - 37:16 37:18, 39:12, 56:11, 58:19, 58:23, analogous [1] - 10:22 Attorney [41] - 6:1, 6:12, 7:10, 15:24, 58:25, 60:4, 62:9, 87:5, 89:3, 94:23, analogy [1] - 11:12 18:14, 23:19, 25:4, 29:6, 29:11, 29:22, 99:16 analysis [5] - 12:3, 13:7, 53:15, 90:17, 31:3, 37:16, 38:2, 38:4, 38:24, 39:4, agency [3] - 11:4, 28:13 39:15, 39:18, 52:21, 56:18, 56:21, 93.1 agency-wide [1] - 28:13 ANDREW [1] - 1:12 58:8, 58:10, 60:2, 62:14, 62:15, 76:14, ago [5] - 19:5, 47:7, 75:9, 75:16, 78:1 77:8, 77:11, 77:13, 78:4, 78:5, 78:13, Andrew [1] - 4:20 agree [18] - 19:19, 37:6, 52:18, 59:16, **ANELLO**[1] - 2:11 78:14, 91:25, 94:2, 94:5, 94:11, 94:13, 59:17, 59:20, 60:20, 60:22, 61:1, 99:12, 103:22 Anello [1] - 5:1 61:25, 67:15, 72:16, 73:13, 78:3, attorneys [4] - 44:8, 57:1, 57:24, 88:3 answer [7] - 6:9, 74:24, 77:16, 79:20, 82:13, 82:22, 87:10, 100:25 87:2, 87:13, 94:6 attractive [1] - 55:16 agreed [6] - 16:4, 47:14, 58:23, 60:3, August [5] - 9:21, 18:10, 95:16, 96:14, answers [2] - 30:17, 41:21 66:7, 100:11 97:5 anticipate [4] - 7:15, 15:12, 49:15, 89:7 agreement [4] - 27:18, 27:19, 27:25, authorized [2] - 50:7, 50:10 anticipated [1] - 7:2 97:9 available [2] - 73:8, 100:15 anyway [6] - 37:19, 38:8, 45:1, 46:16, agreements [1] - 61:24 Avenue [2] - 1:24, 2:12 49:12, 55:21 agrees [1] - 38:12 average [1] - 66:16 apart [1] - 88:4 ahead [2] - 18:25, 37:18 avoid [2] - 10:1, 35:10 appear [1] - 32:1 aided [3] - 3:13, 41:23, 46:7 aware [4] - 17:2, 63:17, 90:3, 96:12 appearance [2] - 57:2, 57:19 aider [1] - 45:22 Azzopardi [18] - 2:12, 5:3, 21:10, 29:10, appearances [1] - 4:8 aiders [1] - 42:6 38:14, 40:12, 41:9, 41:21, 41:22, 42:6, appearing [1] - 5:2 aiding [1] - 45:20 42:14, 42:21, 45:18, 46:3, 56:14, applicability [1] - 91:2 airplane [1] - 68:21 103:7, 103:8, 103:11 application [1] - 69:3 aisle [1] - 60:25 Azzopardi's [3] - 45:23, 46:1, 86:7 apply [1] - 43:20 AJC [1] - 52:21 appointed [1] - 37:16 al [2] - 1:9, 4:6 В appointment [1] - 76:14 Albany [1] - 2:18 appreciate [6] - 61:3, 72:21, 74:25, backdoor [1] - 96:15 Alessandra [2] - 2:24, 87:25 83:18, 93:14, 103:8 backing [1] - 69:8 ALI [2] - 2:23, 2:25 approach [1] - 17:15 allegation [11] - 27:2, 27:5, 30:16, backward [1] - 102:13 appropriate [3] - 32:19, 36:5, 66:12 backwards [1] - 80:24 30:25, 35:6, 44:16, 72:10, 79:22, 88:6, appropriately [1] - 26:7 badly [1] - 32:20 94:11. 98:3 April [1] - 79:12 balancing [1] - 51:25 allegations [51] - 19:5, 19:11, 19:13, apropos [1] - 67:21 barrage [1] - 65:18 19:16, 22:4, 24:4, 25:9, 26:25, 27:22, areas [1] - 65:25 based [9] - 7:18, 12:23, 15:3, 25:4, 25:5, 28:22, 29:2, 29:25, 31:22, 32:8, 39:6, arguably [3] - 76:16, 77:7, 92:23 53:23, 54:2, 54:3, 65:20 42:3, 44:12, 45:8, 45:18, 46:3, 46:4, argue [3] - 54:21, 54:22, 55:21 46:11, 59:11, 61:5, 61:19, 63:6, 64:5, basic [1] - 58:3 argued [1] - 66:10 66:8, 66:25, 68:19, 69:6, 69:13, 71:1, basis [4] - 28:13, 48:1, 55:24, 103:2 argument [12] - 10:13, 23:14, 23:18, 72:13, 72:14, 73:7, 73:23, 75:17, battery [1] - 65:11 23:19, 23:23, 38:7, 47:1, 55:7, 67:11, 75:19, 76:3, 76:10, 76:23, 80:2, 81:2, BEACH [1] - 2:8 68:4, 70:20, 103:21 85:24, 87:18, 95:14, 97:16, 98:6 Beach [1] - 5:5 arguments [2] - 89:9, 89:10 alleged [2] - 42:7, 69:25 became [3] - 25:9, 25:14, 95:24 arrived [1] - 68:5 allegedly [3] - 59:20, 67:4, 81:24 becomes [2] - 16:12, 68:18 article [6] - 31:18, 31:19, 31:24, 32:1, alleges [1] - 13:23 becoming [1] - 69:7 32:2, 75:14 Allegra [1] - 4:23 bed [1] - 65:16 aspects [1] - 74:5 allow [1] - 53:15 BEFORE [1] - 1:21 Assembly [5] - 6:12, 7:18, 23:18, 49:23, allowed [5] - 67:18, 68:2, 70:7, 76:25, began [1] - 26:17 92:3 beginning [3] - 9:21, 16:11, 44:2 asserting [1] - 90:18 alluded [1] - 99:8 behalf [9] - 4:22, 5:5, 12:25, 43:7, 57:12, assigned [1] - 26:13 almost [1] - 94:5 57:14, 75:2, 83:19, 84:10 assistant [1] - 11:3 alone [2] - 26:25, 27:6 behavior [2] - 13:20, 77:24 assume [2] - 17:18, 49:18 alterations [1] - 84:16

behind [1] - 61:13 belief [1] - 51:5 bench [1] - 22:21 beneficial [1] - 45:5 benefit [1] - 91:1

Bennett [25] - 3:6, 27:13, 27:14, 27:16, 31:10, 39:16, 39:20, 39:24, 40:8, 40:11, 40:21, 40:25, 41:1, 41:3, 76:8, 76:9, 76:22, 83:19, 84:4, 84:10, 86:4, 86:12, 96:8

Bennett's [1] - 76:11 best [1] - 81:19 better [1] - 44:7

between [12] - 35:13, 58:22, 60:3, 60:12, 72:5, 78:25, 95:18, 96:7, 97:22, 98:25, 99:22, 102:21

beyond [7] - 9:24, 14:25, 17:5, 68:2, 72:14, 77:8, 96:21

Bharara [1] - 54:23

Biaggi [9] - 2:24, 87:25, 88:10, 91:16, 91:24, 92:5, 92:7, 93:2, 93:5

bias [1] - 70:13 big [1] - 29:3 **bill** [1] - 24:9 billing [1] - 37:20

birthday [2] - 81:22, 81:23 bit [3] - 35:20, 65:5, 79:14

Black [1] - 7:19

Blackberries [1] - 21:25 blacked [1] - 20:2

blame [1] - 60:25 blown [1] - 56:1

blurring [2] - 51:5, 67:13

boilerplate [3] - 55:17, 95:15, 98:5

boiling [1] - 67:16 book [1] - 76:19 boom [1] - 64:10

boundaries [6] - 32:13, 60:19, 61:2, 67:16, 67:21, 79:17

boundary [3] - 6:25, 19:9, 33:15 bounds [3] - 16:16, 32:19, 34:13

box [1] - 102:12

 $\textbf{Boylan}\,{}_{[54]}\textbf{-}2:15,\,4:7,\,4:15,\,12:25,$ 13:3, 13:4, 23:3, 23:5, 23:9, 25:17, 25:18, 25:22, 26:1, 27:21, 28:17, 28:21, 30:21, 30:22, 30:23, 31:4, 31:8, 39:3, 57:20, 58:21, 59:10, 59:11, 59:22, 60:13, 60:24, 61:15, 63:5, 63:23, 64:3, 64:19, 65:1, 65:8, 65:21, 68:12, 68:19, 68:23, 68:25, 69:2, 69:16, 76:2, 76:4, 76:22, 92:4, 92:8, 96:8, 96:12, 96:13, 97:9, 97:14

BOYLAN[1] - 1:17

Boylan's [14] - 26:25, 27:11, 57:24, 58:22, 59:18, 60:16, 63:20, 63:21, 64:7, 66:8, 69:12, 76:3, 96:17, 97:15

brainwashed [1] - 22:8 break [1] - 103:20 breathe [1] - 29:3 briefer [1] - 11:11

briefing [5] - 7:5, 7:7, 91:19, 99:1, 103:18

briefly [1] - 100:13

BRINCKERHOFF [1] - 3:2

Brittany [2] - 81:16

Broad [1] - 2:5

broad [1] - 49:11

broadly [1] - 59:10

Broadway [2] - 2:24, 3:5

Broderick [1] - 84:24

Brooklyn [2] - 1:6, 3:11

brought [7] - 6:7, 28:14, 68:16, 73:11,

73:20, 79:5, 89:18

brutal [1] - 30:9 bubbled [1] - 44:2

bulk [1] - 100:15

bully [1] - 61:23 bunch [1] - 89:23

burden [2] - 35:10, 70:22

burdened [2] - 14:16, 86:6 burdensome [2] - 96:5, 102:7

buried [1] - 46:8

BY [10] - 1:25, 2:3, 2:9, 2:13, 2:16, 2:16, 2:19, 2:22, 2:25, 3:7

bystander [1] - 66:17

Cadman [1] - 3:10 calendar [1] - 76:13 camp [1] - 35:11

campaign [7] - 28:19, 31:1, 59:18, 60:13, 60:17, 63:21, 93:10

canceling [1] - 21:17 cancelled [1] - 8:19

cannot [6] - 9:11, 54:21, 55:18, 70:8, 72:16, 102:25

capacity [1] - 90:15

CAPEZZA [3] - 2:17, 2:19, 72:23

Capezza [5] - 57:2, 57:16, 57:23, 68:9, 72:22

care [9] - 22:24, 28:20, 28:21, 29:6, 29:7, 31:2, 38:8

CARRIE [1] - 2:22 case [136] - 5:12, 5:21, 6:3, 6:7, 6:14, 6:17, 6:20, 6:22, 7:3, 7:11, 7:15, 7:20, 7:22, 7:23, 8:3, 8:9, 10:10, 11:18, 11:22, 13:21, 14:4, 14:13, 15:19, 16:14, 16:16, 16:17, 16:18, 17:19, 19:2, 19:8, 19:24, 21:9, 21:25, 22:4, 23:1, 24:11, 24:13, 24:21, 25:13, 26:20, 28:22, 29:4, 29:18, 29:23, 29:25, 32:7, 32:9, 32:14, 32:16, 32:17, 32:22, 33:11, 33:18, 34:8, 34:12, 34:16, 35:25, 36:8, 38:20, 39:20, 40:5, 40:6, 40:9, 40:13, 40:21, 40:25, 41:6, 41:19, 42:4, 43:1, 44:1, 44:11, 44:21, 44:22, 46:22, 47:15, 47:24, 48:24, 49:5, 51:17, 51:18, 52:3, 53:24, 54:21, 56:23, 60:18, 60:19, 63:25, 64:22,

69:8, 71:6, 72:8, 73:19, 75:25, 82:17, 83:20, 83:25, 84:5, 84:7, 84:25, 85:10, 85:16, 85:18, 85:21, 86:9, 86:10, 86:13, 86:17, 86:18, 86:23, 90:5, 91:3, 93:20, 94:8, 94:10, 94:12, 95:1, 95:8, 95:15, 96:5, 96:13, 96:22, 97:17, 98:2, 98:3, 98:6, 98:8, 98:13, 98:16, 98:20, 100:4, 100:7, 100:16, 103:4, 103:8

caselaw [1] - 83:4

cases [5] - 36:1, 36:25, 40:14, 49:1,

84:8

categorical [2] - 90:21, 91:8 categories [6] - 30:23, 59:8, 59:18,

66:10, 67:5, 67:13 Catherine [1] - 4:25 **CATHERINE** [1] - 2:13

CAUSE [1] - 1:20 caused [1] - 21:2 cell [2] - 21:22, 98:18

CELLI [1] - 3:2

center [1] - 54:10

certain [5] - 53:23, 55:14, 85:20, 102:23 certainly [13] - 40:23, 48:11, 60:24,

61:2, 62:25, 63:3, 72:6, 86:16, 87:13, 88:8, 92:25, 93:24, 100:3

challenge [3] - 65:19, 67:10, 67:22 **chamber** [7] - 10:15, 18:23, 88:18, 91:24, 93:6, 93:21, 94:1

changed [1] - 21:19

characterization [4] - 5:22, 19:20, 54:7, 60:23

characterized [2] - 5:20, 66:19

characterizes [1] - 54:5

Charlotte [11] - 3:5, 31:10, 31:13, 39:16, 39:19, 39:24, 40:20, 40:21, 40:25,

41:1, 96:8 chase [1] - 30:11

chasers [1] - 103:13

Chief [1] - 16:17 child [2] - 20:24, 79:5

children [1] - 13:24

choose [1] - 33:7

chose [1] - 93:20

churning [1] - 24:9

Circuit [3] - 7:19, 35:25, 51:22

circular [1] - 11:5

circumstances [4] - 32:18, 53:22,

68:15, 75:19 cited [1] - 48:23

citing [2] - 88:22, 88:24

civil [5] - 4:4, 6:3, 24:11, 30:9, 50:4

CIVIL [1] - 1:20

claim [4] - 41:10, 41:12, 41:20, 101:9

claimed [1] - 26:1 claiming [1] - 68:20

claims [3] - 40:18, 95:14, 98:6

clarification [1] - 45:17 clarify [1] - 13:9

classmate [1] - 81:5

clear [20] - 6:24, 11:18, 21:23, 22:14, 96:22, 97:7, 97:13, 97:22, 101:13 conspiracy [2] - 35:9 33:21, 33:22, 46:10, 46:21, 47:25, Complaint [15] - 18:2, 23:4, 27:2, 27:9, constituent [2] - 90:13, 90:15 48:1, 59:7, 59:15, 59:16, 63:5, 64:20, 28:6, 29:4, 41:1, 41:12, 42:3, 44:13, constituent-related [1] - 90:15 64:25, 70:21, 71:7, 73:1, 103:3 73:3, 74:16, 74:17, 79:21, 88:8 consult [1] - 63:2 clearly [3] - 10:5, 51:22, 65:20 complaint [1] - 28:9 contact [1] - 26:8 Cleary [1] - 37:12 complaints [3] - 28:12, 59:19, 67:3 contacted [1] - 92:4 client [28] - 24:12, 30:15, 30:16, 41:2, complete [2] - 8:10, 8:16 contacts [1] - 31:7 45:11, 45:17, 47:9, 58:9, 61:3, 62:2, completed [1] - 14:12 contain [1] - 99:4 63:2, 69:23, 72:10, 72:18, 78:6, 82:14, completely [1] - 32:22 contest [1] - 16:21 85:22, 86:5, 86:11, 87:13, 87:17, 88:3, complex [2] - 5:16, 36:10 contested [1] - 50:13 89:4, 89:5, 95:14, 95:22, 101:20, complexity [2] - 52:16, 55:23 context [5] - 10:12, 50:4, 50:13, 54:14, 103:1 complicated [1] - 53:3 91:5 client's [7] - 34:12, 58:14, 70:15, 84:20, complied [1] - 94:4 continue [6] - 24:5, 42:5, 44:10, 53:12, 97:6, 97:24, 98:3 comply [2] - 75:21, 95:13 77:22, 100:4 clients [8] - 41:7, 41:8, 41:25, 42:3, complying [1] - 9:13 continued [1] - 65:14 44:9, 44:25, 80:5, 80:9 component [2] - 60:9, 62:7 Continued [1] - 71:8 close [5] - 5:22, 9:12, 27:19, 30:22, comport [1] - 51:7 continues [3] - 13:21, 96:24, 103:5 81:17 comprise [2] - 18:1, 59:13 Continuing [1] - 72:1 closely [1] - 78:25 Computer [1] - 3:13 continuing [4] - 47:19, 65:11, 65:17, clue [1] - 53:19 Computer-aided [1] - 3:13 103:4 co [1] - 49:2 computerized [1] - 3:13 contravention [1] - 6:22 **co-employee** [1] - 49:2 concept [1] - 42:17 conveniently [1] - 9:19 COHEN [4] - 2:22, 39:24, 75:4, 78:16 concern [1] - 40:22 conversation [5] - 7:5, 57:21, 66:13, Cohen [4] - 57:3, 68:9, 75:2, 78:15 concerned [4] - 21:3, 85:8, 85:15, 87:17 76:18, 93:2 collaborating [1] - 34:24 concerning [3] - 31:5, 37:13, 70:2 conversations [5] - 30:18, 72:3, 72:5, collaboratively [1] - 33:25 concluded [1] - 48:15 74:4, 81:2 collateral [1] - 32:25 conclusion [3] - 24:24, 37:6, 51:1 cooperating [1] - 45:12 colleague [4] - 4:15, 4:23, 20:13, 57:3 conclusions [4] - 51:3, 52:2, 55:8, coping [1] - 96:2 colleagues [3] - 4:18, 5:2, 37:1 core [1] - 19:13 55:12 **college** [7] - 27:10, 27:12, 27:18, 60:16, Corporation [2] - 28:10, 68:14 concrete [1] - 95:20 63:20, 65:7, 70:14 correct [5] - 6:8, 34:13, 38:22, 55:22, conduct [3] - 6:6, 8:2, 8:5 College [3] - 86:14, 86:20, 86:23 103:10 conducted [3] - 5:25, 6:11, 29:14 colleges [1] - 30:8 corrected [1] - 18:8 confer [21] - 6:18, 14:11, 14:23, 38:25, collusion [1] - 48:12 59:4, 62:11, 79:15, 80:25, 84:15, correction [1] - 93:4 coming [9] - 27:18, 29:8, 36:21, 44:23, 90:24, 91:14, 92:17, 93:13, 94:20, correspondence [1] - 35:12 48:7, 81:5, 92:12, 101:10 95:3, 95:17, 97:1, 97:4, 98:21, 102:12 correspondences [1] - 89:2 comment [1] - 8:14 CONFERENCE [1] - 1:20 counsel [34] - 5:8, 17:25, 18:19, 21:8, comments [2] - 72:21, 102:20 21:9, 21:22, 22:11, 27:19, 28:5, 28:10, conference [12] - 4:5, 5:14, 24:3, 44:3, Commisso [4] - 81:15, 81:16, 81:25 29:12, 29:19, 36:9, 36:19, 39:22, 65:21, 68:6, 74:1, 87:7, 89:8, 89:17 commit [1] - 63:10 conferences [3] - 80:4, 80:9, 87:19 58:18, 58:23, 59:5, 70:25, 79:16, Committee [3] - 6:12, 23:19, 91:3 80:24, 85:19, 86:7, 86:10, 86:11, conferred [2] - 6:21, 9:15 **committing** [1] - 46:6 88:12, 88:24, 89:13, 93:13, 95:12, conferring [2] - 43:12, 44:20 communicate [1] - 64:8 confers [13] - 30:4, 30:13, 47:17, 80:23, 101:17, 102:22, 103:1 communicated [4] - 63:24, 75:20, 93:25 Counsel [1] - 95:6 83:12, 88:11, 95:10, 97:20, 98:7, communicating [2] - 88:16, 92:10 counsel's [1] - 100:21 100:21, 101:5, 101:24, 102:10 communication [2] - 81:4, 96:7 counseled [1] - 68:17 Confide [1] - 69:4 communications [23] - 21:3, 21:7, confidential [4] - 84:21, 99:14, 99:15, counseling [2] - 92:21, 92:22 22:12, 31:5, 31:7, 39:5, 60:12, 64:4, count [2] - 5:16, 61:17 64:14, 64:16, 76:12, 79:22, 88:14, confidentiality [4] - 84:20, 100:3, 100:6, couple [7] - 18:13, 20:7, 21:12, 33:6, 95:18, 96:7, 96:11, 96:18, 96:20, 63:14, 73:6, 83:24 96:21, 97:7, 97:13, 97:22, 101:13 conflicting [4] - 40:22, 40:24, 84:12, course [20] - 6:5, 17:12, 17:22, 18:4, compel [5] - 43:14, 43:15, 44:5, 56:1, 85:11 22:12, 26:3, 54:8, 57:18, 58:19, 58:25, 102:6 60:8, 61:20, 70:5, 70:22, 86:12, 90:5, connection [1] - 56:23 complainant [3] - 24:18, 24:19, 24:21 90:18, 91:11, 95:9, 99:6 consent [2] - 21:8, 56:18 COURT [142] - 1:1, 4:2, 5:7, 10:5, 11:12, complainant's [1] - 54:3 consider [4] - 63:1, 63:4, 78:7, 98:15 complainants [31] - 6:2, 6:14, 10:8, 11:23, 12:11, 12:15, 12:23, 13:2, 13:5, consideration [1] - 61:10 10:18, 10:21, 12:16, 15:13, 16:23, 13:8, 15:1, 15:7, 15:12, 15:17, 15:21, considerations [1] - 70:23 18:1, 18:12, 31:6, 32:24, 32:25, 39:6, 15:23, 16:9, 16:13, 17:2, 17:6, 17:12, consist [1] - 99:16 44:23, 62:8, 63:25, 64:4, 65:24, 65:25, 19:19, 20:20, 20:24, 23:14, 24:24, consists [1] - 76:2 66:19, 72:7, 75:6, 76:21, 95:19, 96:9, 27:10, 27:13, 32:8, 32:11, 33:5, 33:10,

33:14, 33:23, 34:5, 34:13, 34:24, 35:2, 35:5, 35:22, 36:3, 36:14, 37:20, 37:24, 38:1, 38:4, 38:11, 38:21, 39:19, 39:25, 40:2, 40:15, 40:20, 43:3, 43:6, 43:12, 45:14, 46:21, 46:24, 47:7, 47:14, 49:13, 49:15, 49:18, 49:20, 50:3, 50:6, 50:9, 50:12, 50:17, 50:20, 51:1, 51:11, 51:18, 51:24, 52:2, 52:6, 52:10, 52:13, 52:16, 52:19, 53:11, 53:19, 54:3, 54:8, 54:10, 54:24, 55:7, 55:22, 56:16, 57:7, 57:9, 57:16, 57:18, 59:3, 59:22, 60:5, 62:13, 63:12, 63:15, 63:18, 64:15, 64:22, 65:3, 65:19, 66:3, 66:6, 66:16, 67:8, 68:3, 68:8, 69:18, 70:2, 71:4, 72:21, 74:25, 78:15, 78:17, 83:18, 83:23, 86:25, 87:3, 87:21, 87:23, 89:16, 90:21, 90:23, 91:21, 92:15, 93:11, 93:14, 100:11, 100:14, 100:19, 101:3, 101:6, 102:4, 102:9, 102:18, 103:16 Court [27] - 3:9, 3:10, 8:21, 16:14, 16:15, 21:16, 22:16, 22:22, 23:23, 37:23, 44:11, 63:17, 65:12, 65:19, 72:24, 73:12, 74:2, 74:23, 84:11, 84:19, 87:1, 89:11, 90:4, 96:17, 97:14, 101:24 **court** [3] - 8:24, 44:23, 84:19 Court's [3] - 7:4, 9:24, 22:20 courtesy [1] - 82:12 Courthouse [1] - 1:6 COURTROOM [2] - 4:1, 4:4 courtroom [2] - 5:10, 61:22 courts [1] - 90:7 covered [2] - 90:15, 91:7 **CRAIN** [2] - 1:25, 4:12 Crain [1] - 4:12 creativity [1] - 56:10 credibility [4] - 46:18, 77:3, 80:18, 82:6 crime [1] - 46:6 criminal [1] - 24:11 critical [1] - 7:3 criticize [1] - 31:14 cross [4] - 33:1, 43:20, 66:1, 66:24 cross-examination [2] - 33:1, 66:1 cross-examine [1] - 66:24 crosses [1] - 47:12 CRR [1] - 3:9 Cruz [1] - 7:22 culture [1] - 66:20 **cumbersome** [1] - 91:12 CUOMO [1] - 1:12 Cuomo [46] - 2:2, 4:6, 4:20, 4:23, 5:20, 6:4, 6:10, 6:18, 7:8, 13:23, 14:18, 16:20, 18:8, 20:8, 21:23, 27:3, 28:24, 29:20, 31:18, 35:20, 35:22, 36:8, 41:10, 42:11, 44:9, 44:14, 48:4, 48:8,

58:11, 59:12, 66:20, 75:12, 75:15,

75:24, 76:10, 78:22, 80:16, 81:25,

91:24, 92:17, 92:21, 93:3, 98:25,

99:19, 99:21, 100:1

Cuomo's [17] - 35:11, 36:4, 36:6, 41:23, 42:7, 42:14, 42:24, 70:25, 77:24, 85:19, 88:2, 88:12, 88:24, 90:23, 91:15, 102:20, 102:22 curious [2] - 17:14, 58:13 current [2] - 6:9, 48:2 cut [2] - 30:10, 48:7

D

DANIEL [1] - 2:9 Daniel [1] - 5:4 **DANYA**[1] - 2:16 Danya [1] - 4:14 dark [1] - 72:18 date [5] - 15:4, 18:24, 94:24, 98:9, 101:14 daughter [4] - 9:9, 20:22, 20:25, 35:14 daughter's [2] - 14:24, 34:22 days [2] - 20:11, 28:15 deadline [5] - 10:4, 17:10, 17:11, 40:6, 40:9 deal [5] - 23:8, 29:25, 53:7, 91:13 dealing [1] - 89:19 dealt [1] - 30:1 DeArcy[1] - 54:25 decided [1] - 61:19 decision [2] - 33:8, 42:1 declaration [1] - 98:1 defend [5] - 6:10, 23:13, 24:12, 44:14, 44:17 Defendant [2] - 2:1, 2:8 defendant [15] - 9:4, 11:20, 36:1, 50:1, 54:16, 75:12, 75:15, 75:24, 76:10, 82:9, 86:9, 88:11, 88:24, 98:22, 99:19 defendant's [2] - 7:9, 93:13 defendants [14] - 8:18, 8:22, 38:14, 40:6, 40:13, 40:15, 59:13, 60:17, 65:12, 75:25, 79:10, 80:10, 84:3, 94:12 Defendants [3] - 1:10, 1:16, 2:11 defendants' [1] - 33:19 defending [1] - 46:22 defense [13] - 24:5, 24:11, 29:7, 30:1, 36:9, 79:16, 80:24, 94:7, 94:10, 95:12, 96:22, 98:8, 100:5 Defense [1] - 95:6 defer [1] - 13:11 deficiency [1] - 7:8 definition [5] - 26:6, 37:9, 55:13, 55:17, 82:3 definitions [1] - 51:7 degree [2] - 30:6, 39:15 deleting [1] - 69:3 demand [1] - 9:3 denied [2] - 37:17, 96:19 Department [4] - 26:12, 30:9, 73:4, 73:24 department [1] - 11:2

82:21, 82:22, 86:8, 86:12, 86:13 deposed [9] - 8:17, 13:17, 14:18, 16:4, 19:5, 20:12, 35:21, 35:22, 36:9 deposition [53] - 8:17, 8:18, 9:4, 9:5, 9:10, 12:16, 13:12, 16:24, 18:9, 18:10, 18:20, 19:1, 19:3, 19:6, 19:15, 20:3, 20:9, 20:10, 20:11, 20:12, 21:5, 21:8, 21:19, 21:20, 22:6, 22:13, 24:1, 24:19, 25:12, 26:9, 29:21, 36:4, 36:7, 36:19, 36:23, 36:24, 43:2, 45:23, 47:18, 48:16, 54:4, 77:19, 77:22, 79:11, 83:2, 83:7, 83:12, 86:6, 97:7, 99:5, 99:16, 101:10, 101:15 depositions [20] - 12:12, 13:9, 13:10, 15:13, 16:1, 17:5, 18:16, 21:15, 21:17, 23:21, 24:17, 25:11, 27:7, 29:9, 29:10, 29:12, 41:14, 41:15, 79:8, 82:20 deputy [1] - 5:10 Deputy [1] - 37:16 **DEPUTY** [2] - 4:1, 4:4 DeRosa [25] - 2:11, 5:3, 14:6, 17:16, 21:9, 29:10, 38:14, 40:12, 40:17, 40:19, 41:2, 41:8, 41:20, 42:5, 42:13, 42:21, 46:4, 56:14, 86:4, 86:7, 86:9, 86:12, 86:13, 103:7 described [3] - 17:17, 48:4, 55:17 designated [1] - 84:21 designation [1] - 100:7 despite [1] - 31:11 destroy [1] - 69:4 detail [1] - 18:17 detailed [2] - 90:19, 91:8 details [1] - 25:6 determination [1] - 71:5 **determine** [1] - 39:1 **detour** [2] - 86:15, 86:16 detrimental [1] - 92:21 develop [2] - 16:18, 16:22 developed [1] - 6:24 Development [2] - 28:10, 68:14 Devil's [1] - 92:20 Diane [8] - 20:13, 20:15, 20:16, 20:18, 21:4, 21:20, 22:6, 48:17 dictate [1] - 63:23 different [18] - 9:23, 10:14, 10:17, 11:10, 28:19, 32:22, 34:17, 40:5, 40:14, 51:16, 70:15, 72:12, 76:23, 81:11, 83:24, 91:6, 99:13, 102:9 differently [2] - 14:14, 91:4 difficult [2] - 34:1, 55:25 dig [1] - 47:4 dilemma [2] - 16:14, 16:15 direct [2] - 6:22, 65:12 direction [1] - 45:13 directly [5] - 9:11, 10:15, 13:23, 66:8, 67:25 director [3] - 63:21, 64:7, 65:6 dirt [2] - 13:23, 13:25 disagree [1] - 100:22 disappointing [2] - 24:8, 34:3

depose [9] - 10:20, 12:7, 41:3, 41:17,

disclosed [1] - 77:25 80:20, 80:21, 80:22, 85:5, 85:16, disclosure [3] - 27:25, 78:9, 87:4 87:12, 89:2, 94:3, 94:5, 94:24, 101:11, 101:15, 101:19 disclosures [2] - 10:9, 78:11 Doe [2] - 3:2, 57:15 discover [2] - 32:19, 46:25 domain [1] - 79:9 discoverable [1] - 96:20 domino [1] - 61:20 discovery [59] - 5:14, 5:15, 5:21, 5:23, 6:3, 6:4, 6:6, 6:19, 7:7, 8:10, 8:16, done [9] - 8:15, 17:20, 42:14, 42:17, 9:21, 10:2, 10:6, 10:19, 13:3, 13:18, 47:6, 59:14, 61:23, 82:24, 82:25 76:5 14:5, 14:13, 15:3, 17:10, 17:19, 19:12, doubt [1] - 25:12 22:17, 22:25, 23:10, 24:16, 30:9, Doug [1] - 4:15 32:16, 33:3, 36:7, 36:18, 38:19, 38:20, **DOUGLAS**[1] - 2:16 39:21, 40:3, 40:6, 40:9, 44:7, 44:15, down [6] - 26:19, 45:24, 69:22, 70:10, 44:16, 44:24, 48:11, 48:13, 51:15, 70:11, 89:18 53:4, 53:15, 54:11, 56:5, 62:14, 65:2, dozen [2] - 95:10, 98:7 71:7, 81:14, 84:3, 84:25, 85:2, 85:3, dozens [1] - 17:3 85:8, 95:14 drafted [3] - 29:5, 45:25, 95:13 discredited [1] - 87:18 drafts [1] - 76:19 discrimination [3] - 37:9, 49:1, 54:14 dragged [5] - 61:12, 61:21, 72:19, discuss [4] - 9:1, 33:14, 89:5, 92:1 74:21, 102:24 Enity [1] - 2:18 discussed [4] - 9:16, 10:12, 52:20, drastically [1] - 21:19 enter [1] - 84:22 70:16 drawn [1] - 79:18 discussing [8] - 20:15, 21:22, 22:4, drill [1] - 26:19 65:23, 78:6, 80:6, 90:14, 92:12 drop [3] - 18:1, 41:25, 42:4 discussion [5] - 23:15, 47:24, 56:12, $\boldsymbol{due}\,{\scriptscriptstyle [5]}\,\text{-}\,15{:}23,\,52{:}24,\,67{:}12,\,70{:}3,$ 63:10, 92:16 100:23 discussions [7] - 34:3, 53:24, 65:24, during [13] - 13:21, 19:6, 25:16, 25:24, 98:10, 100:6 67:16, 92:18, 101:21, 102:21 29:8, 30:7, 32:16, 41:15, 73:5, 73:25, Entity [1] - 72:24 dismiss [4] - 14:7, 40:18, 41:22, 42:2 74:1, 92:2, 93:22 disparaging [2] - 80:5, 80:9 disproportionate [5] - 66:3, 66:12, E 70:21, 92:24, 96:5 dispute [2] - 43:23, 43:24 e-mail [1] - 97:5 100:1, 103:6 disputes [3] - 56:4, 84:4, 84:25 early [3] - 14:4, 79:1, 93:22 earplugs [1] - 30:5 disputing [1] - 68:24 distinguished [1] - 88:4 earth [1] - 46:13 ESI [1] - 22:11 **DISTRICT** [2] - 1:1, 1:1 East [2] - 2:15, 3:10 District [7] - 27:17, 39:20, 83:20, 84:5, Eastern [1] - 86:24 86:9, 86:13, 86:24 **EASTERN**[1] - 1:1 3:7 district [2] - 35:25, 66:15 edits [1] - 84:16 Esq [1] - 2:6 disturbing [1] - 13:20 **EEOC** [2] - 51:17, 54:14 divorce [1] - 80:8 effect [3] - 22:7, 61:15, 61:20 **docket** [3] - 4:5, 4:6, 96:13 efficiently [1] - 85:10 dockets [1] - 5:17 effort [6] - 6:19, 32:19, 38:25, 44:21, et [2] - 1:8, 4:6 docs [1] - 31:6 56:4, 90:24 document [8] - 13:13, 40:3, 42:19, efforts [2] - 54:11, 90:11 42:22, 59:9, 75:22, 79:11, 86:7 eight [2] - 10:20, 28:4 documentary [1] - 13:5 Eisenberg [5] - 40:1, 40:2, 57:9, 83:19, documentation [3] - 84:21, 85:14, 86:20 EISENBERG [8] - 3:5, 3:7, 40:1, 83:22, documented [1] - 79:3 84:11, 87:1, 87:8, 87:22 events [1] - 74:6 either [5] - 17:4, 36:19, 56:2, 85:18, documenting [1] - 28:3 102:11 documents [62] - 8:22, 14:9, 17:4, 18:11, 18:21, 22:15, 23:5, 23:21, 27:7, **electronic** [1] - 22:12 30:12, 30:15, 31:5, 37:13, 38:24, 39:1, Elizabeth [1] - 28:11 39:10, 39:17, 41:4, 42:20, 42:21, email [1] - 3:12 ex [2] - 80:7 42:23, 43:11, 58:18, 59:8, 59:9, 59:14, embarrassed [1] - 63:6 59:17, 60:3, 60:5, 64:12, 64:18, 67:25, **EMERY** [1] - 3:2 74:7, 74:8, 74:10, 75:9, 75:23, 76:1, eminently [1] - 85:17 76:8, 76:16, 76:18, 76:19, 76:20, 77:6, Empire [2] - 28:10, 68:13 62:9, 74:11 77:7, 77:12, 77:13, 77:20, 79:12,

employ [1] - 56:3 employed [2] - 38:13, 93:23 employee [2] - 49:2, 57:2 Employee [2] - 2:18, 72:25 employees [3] - 28:8, 99:11 employer's [1] - 49:3 employment [4] - 49:2, 59:19, 68:16, enable [1] - 42:14 enabled [1] - 42:6 encourage [1] - 91:14 encouragement [1] - 76:9 end [3] - 8:16, 10:5, 16:23 endured [1] - 75:11 enforce [1] - 31:15 enforcement [1] - 65:13 engage [1] - 56:4 engaged [2] - 90:13, 95:11 entire [3] - 88:18, 88:21, 88:25 entirety [2] - 6:11, 7:20 entities [1] - 18:22 entitled [11] - 7:23, 8:7, 8:8, 11:14, 16:20, 46:24, 48:12, 60:12, 61:16, entries [1] - 76:13 environment [18] - 7:20, 10:10, 10:13, 10:14, 10:25, 11:4, 11:24, 37:7, 47:21, 47:24, 55:13, 55:20, 75:6, 81:13, equivalent [1] - 11:20 ESD [3] - 28:6, 28:8, 28:12 ESQ [14] - 1:25, 1:25, 2:3, 2:3, 2:4, 2:9, 2:13, 2:16, 2:16, 2:19, 2:22, 2:25, 3:4, essential [1] - 12:1 essentially [3] - 14:13, 65:12, 69:23 establish [3] - 47:22, 53:24, 66:20 ethical [2] - 34:11, 61:9 ethically [1] - 34:9 evaluate [2] - 47:15, 48:6 evaluation [1] - 7:4 eve [2] - 20:14, 22:5 evening [1] - 82:2 eventually [1] - 84:22 evidence [9] - 7:21, 8:8, 13:6, 35:8, 35:9, 46:18, 47:16, 48:20, 48:23 evidentiary [3] - 19:9, 55:24, 56:1 ex-husband [2] - 80:7 exact [2] - 36:6, 59:9 exactly [6] - 23:22, 48:4, 50:6, 51:24,

examination [2] - 33:1, 66:1 73:22 18:20, 26:5, 45:12, 53:11, 66:23, factually [1] - 36:10 75:11, 75:13, 76:9, 77:24, 81:5, 92:6, examine [1] - 66:24 example [5] - 16:3, 23:8, 30:20, 53:16, fair [6] - 8:7, 17:6, 23:16, 31:22, 34:25, 92:12, 92:13, 102:13, 103:2, 103:17 79:21 68:3 FOTI [6] - 2:13, 4:25, 40:23, 43:4, faith [1] - 30:19 102:17, 102:19 examples [4] - 34:19, 63:25, 94:14, 95:6 except [4] - 18:13, 96:11, 97:8, 103:8 falsely [1] - 68:20 Foti [5] - 4:25, 40:19, 40:20, 45:17, 102:18 **exception** [5] - 8:6, 44:1, 47:23, 52:13, family [2] - 73:15, 95:24 four [5] - 28:15, 68:22, 82:22, 83:2, 83:5 52.14 far [10] - 47:4, 52:25, 54:4, 60:10, 60:15, exchanged [1] - 94:25 60:18, 66:15, 67:5, 70:19, 84:18 fourth [2] - 81:4, 81:5 fourth-grade [1] - 81:5 exchanges [1] - 22:10 fashion [2] - 80:20, 83:7 frankly [4] - 23:9, 34:3, 73:10, 74:8 executive [7] - 10:15, 18:23, 78:23, fault [2] - 8:1 fraught [1] - 89:20 91:24, 93:6, 93:21, 94:1 favorite [3] - 16:17, 24:7 exhausting [1] - 73:6 February [2] - 24:3, 68:24 Friday [1] - 5:18 friends [5] - 73:15, 74:5, 81:17, 81:19, Exhibit [1] - 98:1 federal [2] - 75:16, 90:7 95:24 exists [2] - 12:21, 23:6 feet [1] - 63:1 fellows [1] - 26:13 frolic [2] - 86:14, 86:15 **exonerate** [1] - 12:8 front [5] - 26:21, 28:8, 29:5, 54:10, expect [1] - 29:20 felt [1] - 90:9 expedition [3] - 35:19, 82:4, 83:16 female [1] - 12:1 67:22 frustrating [1] - 29:9 **experience** [6] - 51:6, 59:25, 73:6, 73:8, few [4] - 19:21, 74:14, 76:12, 79:7 full [7] - 35:18, 36:5, 56:1, 79:4, 82:23, 73:25, 92:1 Fifth [2] - 1:24, 2:12 91:7, 99:17 experienced [2] - 34:6, 79:1 fight [1] - 70:12 full-blown [1] - 56:1 experiences [5] - 73:22, 74:21, 86:1, figure [1] - 33:15 full-time [1] - 79:4 92:6, 92:10 file [6] - 43:16, 43:17, 43:20, 89:7, explain [3] - 20:11, 56:13, 99:23 fully [3] - 19:17, 29:20, 52:23 89:14, 89:24 fundraising [1] - 59:19 explained [1] - 95:22 filed [5] - 5:18, 6:22, 12:24, 45:24, 85:3 funny [1] - 69:15 **explore** [6] - 19:17, 22:13, 28:20, 28:25, filing [4] - 6:21, 43:13, 43:23, 89:16 furtherance [2] - 90:11, 91:17 60:11, 69:11 fill [2] - 16:6, 94:20 explored [1] - 60:2 finally [2] - 95:16, 95:20 G exploring [1] - 68:13 findings [7] - 50:5, 50:6, 50:13, 50:24, expose [1] - 44:25 51:13, 52:4, 54:2 gallery [2] - 18:3, 36:5 expressed [1] - 80:1 fine [2] - 74:3, 74:14 gap [1] - 94:21 extend [1] - 17:10 Fine [1] - 28:11 gaps [4] - 16:6, 56:12, 94:15, 94:19 extensive [1] - 39:5 firm [6] - 5:1, 17:10, 37:12, 103:11, garnered [1] - 95:25 103:12 **extensively** [1] - 59:21 Garnsey [1] - 2:8 extent [25] - 9:7, 12:21, 13:13, 13:14, firms [1] - 37:18 gathering [2] - 90:11, 91:17 14:10, 14:16, 14:22, 15:20, 17:8, 19:7, first [21] - 7:1, 7:13, 9:10, 10:11, 13:18, general [1] - 7:10 21:7, 22:22, 34:6, 46:23, 62:19, 65:21, 17:23, 32:4, 36:25, 37:2, 48:16, 48:22, General [12] - 6:12, 23:19, 60:2, 77:13, 67:10, 73:12, 76:21, 79:14, 82:17, 59:24, 62:16, 62:24, 72:20, 79:11, 78:4, 78:13, 78:14, 94:3, 94:5, 94:13, 89:23, 90:8, 92:9, 92:11 80:25, 84:11, 94:6, 99:8, 101:4 99:12, 103:22 extorted [1] - 103:13 fishing [3] - 35:19, 82:3, 83:16 General's [28] - 6:1, 7:10, 15:24, 18:15, **extortion** [1] - 46:6 fit [1] - 16:19 25:4, 29:6, 29:11, 29:22, 31:3, 38:2, extortionist [2] - 45:21, 45:25 five [1] - 103:21 38:5, 38:24, 39:4, 39:15, 39:18, 52:21, extortionists [1] - 103:14 flights [1] - 68:22 56:18, 56:21, 58:8, 58:10, 62:14, extraneously [1] - 46:18 Floor [1] - 3:2 62:15, 76:15, 77:8, 77:11, 78:6, 91:25, extraordinarily [2] - 44:5, 81:17 flying [2] - 30:3, 30:10 94:11 extremely [5] - 5:24, 43:21, 72:17, focused [1] - 94:22 Generals [1] - 37:16 99:24, 99:25 **FOERSTER** [1] - 2:20 generated [1] - 6:5 folks [2] - 15:15, 36:11 generis [1] - 15:19 F follow [2] - 62:21, 70:8 geographic [1] - 11:5 followed [1] - 44:1 gist [1] - 14:1 facing [4] - 16:15, 18:6, 40:9 follower [1] - 69:5 given [11] - 10:6, 21:13, 31:22, 34:19, fact [19] - 11:4, 11:8, 14:20, 18:9, 37:1, FOR [1] - 1:20 45:2, 58:4, 64:24, 77:20, 83:25, 97:11, 46:14, 51:2, 51:13, 74:10, 79:14, forgot [1] - 68:11 98.14 80:23, 81:19, 88:18, 89:4, 90:16, former [4] - 4:19, 18:17, 20:13, 94:4 glad [1] - 65:20 90:17, 91:17, 92:7, 92:18 Former [1] - 63:8 glaring [1] - 88:9 fact-intensive [1] - 90:17 forth [4] - 30:10, 31:10, 58:22, 76:5 factor [1] - 15:15 Glaser [1] - 26:15 **forthcoming** [1] - 96:16 Glavin [38] - 4:17, 4:19, 17:13, 32:21, facts [3] - 50:17, 50:21, 75:18 forum [1] - 6:8 factual [11] - 50:5, 50:6, 50:13, 50:24, 34:18, 34:20, 44:21, 48:10, 49:6,

forward [20] - 6:2, 10:18, 15:13, 18:15,

51:13, 52:4, 52:6, 52:8, 55:23, 73:20,

52:19, 58:20, 59:5, 61:14, 62:21,

64:23, 68:8, 69:18, 69:21, 80:4, 80:8, Hamilton [3] - 86:14, 86:20, 86:22 history [5] - 9:9, 13:14, 59:18, 67:2, 81:10, 81:20, 82:1, 82:21, 85:6, 85:18, hammer [1] - 89:18 99:21 92:24, 94:14, 94:17, 94:22, 95:17, holding [1] - 57:23 hand [1] - 12:1 96:6, 96:10, 96:15, 97:5, 97:21, 97:25, holdings [1] - 50:25 handed [2] - 48:19, 89:2 100.14 hole [3] - 69:22, 70:10, 94:21 happy [2] - 74:24, 87:2 **GLAVIN** [36] - 2:1, 2:3, 4:17, 17:23, holes [2] - 70:11, 94:15 harass [5] - 11:19, 21:7, 44:10, 77:22 19:21, 20:22, 20:25, 23:17, 24:25, harassed [7] - 12:20, 24:23, 26:6, 27:4, holiday [1] - 31:24 27:11, 27:14, 32:10, 33:21, 33:24, 27:24, 41:20, 65:1 home [4] - 18:3, 73:10, 74:13 37:14, 37:21, 37:25, 38:17, 39:2, honest [1] - 25:24 harassing [1] - 82:7 39:23, 40:3, 40:17, 59:6, 63:13, 64:17, harassment [35] - 7:21, 11:9, 11:10, honestly [2] - 22:24, 85:15 64:24, 68:10, 91:20, 91:22, 93:8, 11:15, 24:6, 26:6, 28:23, 28:24, 30:25, Honor [92] - 4:10, 4:12, 4:17, 4:21, 4:25, 100:13, 100:18, 100:20, 101:4, 101:8, 5:4, 7:16, 7:24, 8:10, 8:13, 8:14, 8:25, 41:3, 41:11, 41:16, 41:23, 42:7, 42:15, 102:8 45:22, 46:7, 48:24, 51:6, 52:6, 55:17, 10:24, 11:18, 12:6, 12:17, 14:2, 14:8, Glavin's [2] - 38:6, 67:20 59:23, 59:25, 61:5, 63:8, 64:20, 67:12, 15:14, 16:1, 16:6, 17:8, 17:9, 22:21, goal [1] - 44:5 70:23, 75:12, 78:21, 79:2, 82:4, 88:6, 29:2, 33:4, 33:22, 34:11, 35:1, 35:24, God [2] - 80:13, 96:1 88:20, 99:24 36:12, 37:1, 37:5, 37:17, 37:21, 38:3, goodbye [1] - 41:8 hard [6] - 12:12, 30:17, 47:15, 62:10, 38:9, 43:10, 45:2, 49:21, 50:5, 50:16, govern [1] - 86:19 62:21, 78:17 51:10, 51:21, 52:15, 54:12, 55:3, 56:9, Government [2] - 6:5, 18:22 57:17, 58:16, 60:18, 61:4, 61:9, 61:25, hard-pressed [1] - 12:12 government [1] - 75:16 62:4, 62:7, 63:13, 65:4, 66:4, 67:22, harm [1] - 87:20 governments [1] - 5:25 67:23, 68:12, 70:14, 72:15, 72:23, Harris [1] - 5:5 governor [1] - 54:22 HARRIS [1] - 2:8 75:4, 78:18, 83:15, 87:24, 88:1, 89:1, 89:6, 89:14, 93:4, 93:13, 93:17, 93:18, Governor [91] - 4:19, 4:22, 5:20, 6:3, hates [1] - 30:9 94:6, 95:4, 95:10, 96:17, 96:19, 97:19, 6:10, 6:18, 7:7, 8:1, 8:3, 8:8, 9:4, 9:7, head [2] - 28:6, 71:2 98:17, 98:23, 99:7, 99:8, 100:8, 9:19, 10:25, 11:6, 11:13, 11:25, 12:7, headed [1] - 24:14 100:20, 102:19 12:20, 13:17, 14:21, 16:20, 18:8, 19:1, heal [2] - 73:11, 74:14 19:14, 20:8, 21:23, 22:4, 25:1, 25:3, **Honor's** [10] - 8:14, 48:22, 49:12, 60:20, Health [2] - 73:4, 73:25 26:2, 26:8, 26:15, 27:3, 27:16, 27:24, 60:23, 70:8, 77:16, 78:2, 97:18, 99:2 healthy [1] - 13:19 28:16, 31:6, 31:18, 31:25, 35:20, HONORABLE [1] - 1:21 hear [5] - 7:13, 7:20, 17:14, 41:6, 96:1 35:22, 36:4, 36:6, 36:8, 41:10, 41:23, hoops [1] - 89:23 heard [9] - 31:20, 33:4, 44:12, 63:13, 42:7, 42:11, 42:14, 42:24, 44:9, 44:14, hope [1] - 58:17 69:15, 75:2, 89:22, 94:14, 100:13 45:24, 46:2, 46:12, 46:13, 53:16, hopeful [1] - 68:5 hearing [2] - 44:8, 52:20 55:11, 55:15, 60:1, 61:15, 63:8, 64:21, hopefully [1] - 65:17 hearings [1] - 56:1 66:20, 68:20, 73:25, 75:7, 75:8, 78:22, hoping [1] - 60:14 hearsay [8] - 25:5, 50:14, 50:15, 52:10, 78:23, 79:23, 81:19, 85:19, 88:2, 88:6, host [1] - 23:11 52:11, 52:12, 52:13, 52:15 88:19, 90:23, 91:15, 91:24, 92:17, **hostile** [7] - 7:20, 10:10, 47:23, 55:13, $\textbf{heavily} \, {\tiny [3]} \, \textbf{-} \, 19{:}18, \, 19{:}19, \, 62{:}22$ 92:21, 94:4, 98:25, 99:6, 99:21, 100:1, 66:20, 100:1, 103:6 heavy [1] - 48:19 102:20, 102:21 hours [8] - 16:4, 24:9, 29:16, 82:23, heavy-handed [1] - 48:19 Governor's [11] - 8:17, 21:22, 22:15, 83:2, 83:6, 83:10 held [2] - 80:4, 80:8 26:14, 28:5, 28:24, 29:20, 45:20, Howard [5] - 26:15, 28:6, 68:22, 68:23, hello [1] - 41:8 64:25, 81:11, 90:10 69:25 help [2] - 32:7, 76:3 governs [1] - 86:11 HUD [1] - 75:9 helped [1] - 76:10 grade [2] - 81:4, 81:5 hundred [1] - 75:23 HERBERT [1] - 3:7 GRAND [1] - 2:11 hundreds [2] - 79:12, 91:19 Herbert [1] - 40:1 grand [1] - 35:8 hurt [1] - 72:7 herbert [1] - 40:2 Grand [1] - 5:1 husband [6] - 20:22, 20:25, 35:14, 74:5, herself [2] - 48:20, 92:12 granted [1] - 96:18 80:7 hesitate [1] - 74:8 granular [1] - 93:1 husband's [4] - 14:23, 20:18, 20:19, hi [1] - 64:9 granularity [1] - 96:23 34:22 hiding [1] - 8:20 great [2] - 42:1, 48:7 hydra [1] - 24:14 highly [2] - 51:8 guess [1] - 12:14 hypothetical [1] - 76:25 HILL [1] - 2:17 guide [1] - 102:14 himself [3] - 44:17, 57:10, 99:19 **guidelines** [1] - 44:6 I hinted [1] - 17:9 guys [2] - 91:1, 102:9 Hinton [19] - 2:21, 13:22, 57:3, 75:3,

Н

half [5] - 94:9, 95:10, 97:24, 98:7, 98:18

hall [1] - 26:14 **Hall** [1] - 54:25

Hinton's [2] - 76:18, 77:22 **hired** [4] - 26:10, 26:12, 26:15, 26:17

78:3, 78:9, 78:13

75:5, 75:21, 76:4, 76:7, 76:22, 76:24,

77:2, 77:4, 77:5, 77:10, 77:14, 77:23,

IASON [1] - 2:11

lason [1] - 5:1

idea [3] - 32:24, 45:15, 45:16

identified [1] - 89:10 identified [1] - 94:21 identify [1] - 96:23

identifying [2] - 62:18, 100:9 identities [1] - 19:23 identity [1] - 72:11 imaged [1] - 21:24 images [3] - 21:24, 22:15, 22:18 imagine [1] - 36:21 impact [1] - 85:9 impeach [2] - 66:14, 77:2 impeachment [6] - 46:25, 47:3, 48:11, 66:16, 67:14, 70:13 imperative [1] - 84:20 implicates [1] - 103:7 implications [1] - 6:14 implied [1] - 27:23 implore [1] - 48:3 importance [2] - 24:20, 25:14 **important** [5] - 5:24, 19:24, 26:19, 56:7, 73:18 **impossible** [1] - 55:25 impressed [1] - 26:16 impression [1] - 22:22 **improper** [1] - 8:2 inadmissible [2] - 52:1, 52:3 inapposite [1] - 86:16 inappropriately [2] - 25:1, 25:3 incident [5] - 77:25, 78:21, 83:3, 83:5, 88:19 inclined [1] - 17:10 include [2] - 87:3, 89:9 included [8] - 7:14, 7:17, 10:8, 31:9, 35:2, 73:2, 74:16, 88:20 includes [1] - 23:1 including [8] - 7:21, 17:1, 18:22, 19:8, 39:7, 58:9, 62:1, 68:20 incomplete [3] - 31:16, 94:13, 94:19 inconvenience [1] - 9:6 inconveniences [1] - 8:5 inconveniencing [1] - 10:1 incredibly [1] - 96:4 independently [1] - 27:16 indicate [1] - 53:22 indicated [1] - 82:21 indicates [1] - 102:22 indicating [1] - 83:4 indication [1] - 81:1 individual [5] - 6:23, 43:22, 43:25, 91:4, 91.6 individually [1] - 78:9 individuals [4] - 41:20, 47:19, 79:4, 103:6 inefficient [1] - 44:5 inform [2] - 17:22, 87:12 information [34] - 6:25, 9:23, 10:21, 12:10, 14:10, 14:12, 16:21, 16:23, 18:16, 18:18, 19:11, 34:15, 36:21, 43:24, 44:13, 45:7, 47:12, 53:22, 56:19, 58:8, 73:15, 78:3, 82:18, 84:8, 85:25, 86:1, 90:10, 91:17, 92:19,

92:23, 93:2, 97:25, 99:20, 100:9

inherent [1] - 52:22 inquiry [1] - 55:6 insinuate [1] - 58:20 insist [1] - 103:5 instance [5] - 9:1, 10:1, 31:10, 39:16, 81:13 instances [1] - 10:10 instead [1] - 94:22 instruction [1] - 49:12 insufficient [1] - 43:21 integrity [2] - 5:24, 5:25 intended [1] - 48:21 intensive [2] - 90:17, 102:6 intent [1] - 69:12 interact [1] - 85:23 interaction [1] - 28:8 interactions [2] - 46:14, 55:10 interest [3] - 32:17, 56:7, 89:21 interested [11] - 2:14, 2:17, 2:20, 2:23, 3:2, 3:5, 5:9, 5:11, 44:20, 68:12, 95:18 interesting [4] - 22:2, 31:2, 42:9, 88:3 intern [3] - 60:17, 63:20, 65:7 interpreted [1] - 90:6 interview [13] - 37:22, 55:5, 58:11, 58:15, 62:9, 62:13, 73:16, 78:5, 87:5, 87:11, 89:3, 92:7, 99:3 interviewed [5] - 78:12, 78:13, 89:4, 92:1, 92:13 interviews [1] - 92:9 intimidate [1] - 48:21 intimidating [1] - 13:19 introduce [7] - 7:1, 11:21, 49:15, 50:22, 51:12, 51:13, 54:17 introduced [1] - 57:10 introducing [1] - 52:22 investigation [16] - 6:9, 6:11, 13:21, 14:10, 23:16, 24:4, 29:22, 37:17, 50:8, 50:11, 54:15, 54:19, 55:4, 65:24, 69:7, investigations [4] - 5:25, 6:2, 6:6, 51:22 investigative [2] - 6:25, 52:24 investigator [1] - 77:11 investigators [8] - 29:13, 50:18, 50:21, 50:23, 50:24, 50:25, 55:8, 76:14 investigators' [1] - 51:1 involved [3] - 5:14, 28:7, 65:23 involvement[1] - 46:9 involving [1] - 103:21 iPhone [1] - 22:1 irony [1] - 30:21

88:21, 89:19, 90:2, 90:25 **issuing** [2] - 9:11, 65:13 **items** [1] - 87:16 **itself** [1] - 73:5

J

Jackson [9] - 20:4, 25:18, 25:20, 25:22, 26:3, 37:4, 37:6, 55:7, 55:10 Jackson's [6] - 25:12, 25:16, 32:20, 55:9, 55:11, 55:21 James [1] - 54:22 job [3] - 28:15, 76:4, 76:11 John [1] - 4:12 JOHN [1] - 1:25 joining [1] - 13:15 joint [2] - 17:18, 43:22 jointly [1] - 43:23 joking [1] - 102:5 Joseph [1] - 5:2 Journal [1] - 25:19 judge [2] - 54:18, 91:22 JUDGE [1] - 1:21 Judge [4] - 17:23, 22:23, 54:25, 84:24 judgement [1] - 6:20 Judiciary [3] - 6:12, 23:18, 91:3 July [1] - 80:25 jump [1] - 89:22 June [2] - 13:21, 40:7 jurist [1] - 48:1 jury [3] - 7:20, 16:19, 54:17 Justice [1] - 30:8

K

Kaitlin [19] - 3:2, 31:20, 31:23, 39:11, 57:15, 92:3, 92:8, 93:19, 93:24, 94:1, 94:25, 95:7, 95:18, 96:7, 96:11, 96:18, 96:24, 99:14 Kaitlin's [9] - 31:21, 94:12, 94:18, 99:5, 99:17, 100:5, 100:20, 101:10, 101:17 Karen [1] - 2:21 Katherine [1] - 4:18 **KATHERINE** [1] - 2:4 Kayasha [1] - 5:2 keep [3] - 24:2, 28:16, 102:1 kept [1] - 72:8 kick [1] - 32:8 kicking [1] - 61:12 kid [1] - 30:5 kids' [1] - 20:17 kill [1] - 11:21 kind [2] - 89:17, 96:7 kinds [1] - 99:7 knowledge [3] - 25:5, 26:1, 49:3 known [1] - 41:21 knows [9] - 5:13, 20:9, 26:6, 29:24, 36:9, 43:24, 46:15, 48:11, 92:9 Korman [1] - 4:18 KORMAN[1] - 2:3

irrelevant [3] - 24:24, 24:25, 37:6

82:18, 88:9, 98:13, 100:8

issued [3] - 27:6, 27:17, 56:23

issues [25] - 5:16, 5:23, 9:16, 9:19,

40:14, 43:20, 44:10, 52:22, 65:15,

issue [15] - 9:22, 14:4, 22:20, 39:2, 44:2,

15:23, 16:7, 17:14, 32:25, 36:8, 36:18,

67:8, 69:23, 70:1, 79:16, 88:18, 88:20,

54:4, 54:6, 65:11, 66:2, 69:20, 71:3,

L

labeled [1] - 61:22 laborious [1] - 44:24 lack [2] - 53:22, 79:17

lacking [4] - 7:5, 7:6, 38:11, 56:9

lacks [2] - 53:25, 54:18 landscape [1] - 17:22 language [1] - 52:3

large [4] - 19:21, 19:24, 27:9, 62:22 last [12] - 5:16, 30:2, 30:3, 31:21, 35:23, 35:24, 37:11, 57:7, 62:7, 74:14, 78:2, 92.3

latitude [1] - 49:10

law [8] - 7:19, 11:18, 16:17, 34:13, 49:7, 51:2, 52:3, 67:18

Law [1] - 4:14 LAW [2] - 2:14, 2:23 lawsuit [2] - 18:4, 27:20

lawsuits [2] - 79:6 lawyer [3] - 24:11, 24:12, 30:1

lawyers [5] - 22:8, 30:6, 33:18, 33:19,

layers [2] - 52:16, 55:23 layout [1] - 100:23

LDH)(TAM[2] - 1:4, 1:13

leading [1] - 31:19

learn [3] - 9:10, 97:21, 97:23 learned [3] - 25:16, 30:24, 45:23

least [5] - 45:5, 65:13, 75:22, 77:14, 101:12

leave [2] - 60:6, 89:14 leaving [1] - 68:15

left [16] - 27:22, 27:24, 28:3, 28:4, 28:14, 28:19, 28:23, 28:25, 59:23, 60:2, 60:6, 67:12, 73:10, 93:10, 94:1

legal [7] - 17:22, 24:24, 37:5, 51:3, 51:7, 52:2, 55:12

legally [3] - 34:9, 50:7, 50:10

legislation [1] - 91:18

legislative [9] - 88:15, 88:19, 88:25, 90:2, 90:4, 90:5, 90:11, 90:18, 91:2

legislator [2] - 91:4, 92:13 legislator's [1] - 91:6

legislators [1] - 90:7

legislature [1] - 6:1

length [2] - 52:20, 80:5

lengthy [2] - 21:18, 23:15

Leo [1] - 4:18

LEO[1] - 2:3

less [4] - 37:8, 78:5, 97:16, 98:14 **letter** [5] - 5:20, 7:19, 13:22, 17:18,

89:17

letters [2] - 30:3, 30:10

level [1] - 11:5 levels [1] - 66:13 leverage [1] - 48:13

liar [2] - 61:23, 63:7

LICUL [70] - 1:25, 4:10, 7:16, 10:24,

11:17, 12:5, 12:13, 12:17, 13:1, 13:4, 13:7, 13:10, 15:5, 15:8, 15:14, 15:19, 15:22, 15:25, 16:10, 17:1, 17:3, 17:8, 33:4, 33:6, 33:13, 33:17, 34:11, 34:18, 35:1, 35:4, 35:6, 35:23, 36:12, 36:23, 37:15, 38:3, 38:6, 45:16, 46:23, 47:2, 47:10, 48:14, 49:14, 49:17, 49:19, 49:21, 50:5, 50:7, 50:10, 50:15, 50:19, 50:23, 51:10, 51:16, 51:20, 51:25, 52:4, 52:8, 52:11, 52:14, 52:18, 53:10, 53:14, 54:1, 54:6, 54:9, 54:12, 55:2, 55:9, 56:9

Licul [27] - 4:10, 7:13, 10:7, 11:12, 18:24, 19:7, 19:12, 20:7, 20:9, 20:17, 26:23, 32:12, 34:7, 38:12, 38:23, 41:1, 41:25, 44:21, 45:15, 47:25, 51:19, 53:12, 66:18, 66:23, 72:3, 86:3, 103:5

Licul's [2] - 17:15, 71:6

lie [1] - 28:19

Lieutenant [1] - 26:15

life [3] - 25:10, 69:5, 82:8

lift [1] - 100:7

light [2] - 60:6, 60:7

likely [3] - 10:21, 44:9, 51:4

likewise [1] - 83:9

limine [1] - 53:5

limit [5] - 16:14, 59:2, 80:21, 83:9

limitation [1] - 80:18

limitations [1] - 80:25

limited [11] - 11:17, 13:4, 42:9, 42:18, 45:18, 50:4, 66:7, 79:7, 80:20, 83:7, 86:17

limits [7] - 47:10, 61:1, 68:2, 70:7, 72:16, 83:15

Limmiatis [11] - 57:5, 78:20, 78:21, 80:1, 80:5, 80:6, 80:11, 80:22, 82:22, 82:24, 83:1

Lindsey [21] - 2:15, 4:15, 23:3, 26:1, 26:25, 27:11, 28:20, 30:20, 30:21, 30:23, 31:4, 31:8, 39:3, 64:9, 65:1, 68:19, 69:12, 69:16, 92:4, 96:8, 96:12

LINDSEY [1] - 1:17

line [2] - 29:15, 47:12

lines [1] - 51:5

Liss [15] - 20:4, 25:12, 25:16, 25:18, 25:20, 32:20, 37:4, 37:6, 39:11, 55:9, 55:10, 55:11, 76:12, 76:22

Liss-Jackson [6] - 20:4, 25:18, 25:20, 37:4. 37:6. 55:10

Liss-Jackson's [5] - 25:12, 25:16,

32:20, 55:9, 55:11 listing [1] - 85:25

litigants [1] - 47:17

litigate [6] - 8:3, 22:23, 32:15, 69:22, 69:23, 69:24

litigated [2] - 33:11, 36:25

litigation [4] - 8:12, 10:12, 32:18, 77:18

live [2] - 33:16, 72:19

LLP [9] - 1:23, 2:5, 2:17, 2:20, 3:2, 3:5, 4:11, 4:13, 4:22

local [1] - 43:18

log [2] - 90:19, 91:8

look [18] - 17:23, 18:19, 32:14, 44:22, 47:15, 47:22, 48:16, 55:14, 63:2, 63:7, 80:13, 80:15, 81:6, 81:9, 95:21,

102:13, 103:17

looked [3] - 39:8, 78:24, 98:12

looking [9] - 25:21, 47:12, 48:9, 67:17, 79:24, 80:20, 83:14, 92:24, 97:2

looks [3] - 26:10, 26:18, 30:22

losing [1] - 9:20 lost [2] - 9:20, 61:17

love [3] - 28:16, 32:6, 87:9

Lucchese [1] - 3:9

Lyons [1] - 5:2

М

Mad [2] - 37:7, 55:18 MAGISTRATE[1] - 1:21

mail [1] - 97:5

main [2] - 5:11, 70:20

maintained [2] - 84:21, 85:12

manner [1] - 29:14

March [1] - 81:22

mark [1] - 5:22

massive[1] - 28:12

material [2] - 46:25, 47:3

materials [3] - 6:4, 52:24, 89:5

matter [5] - 79:8, 85:9, 99:14, 99:22,

103:25

matters [3] - 40:21, 84:13, 100:16 McGrath [13] - 57:6, 78:20, 78:22, 80:6, 80:23, 81:10, 81:15, 81:17, 81:21,

81:23, 82:6, 82:23, 82:24

mean [20] - 11:9, 11:19, 11:21, 13:19, 13:22, 23:3, 30:20, 48:9, 48:16, 50:3, 50:21, 51:16, 53:6, 55:18, 61:21, 62:20, 67:15, 70:10, 79:24, 83:3

meaningful [1] - 47:16

meaningfully [4] - 6:18, 6:20, 56:4, 90:24

means [2] - 7:24, 18:8

meant [2] - 12:19, 21:6

meantime [2] - 43:19, 56:6

media [4] - 31:7, 63:22, 64:7, 65:6

medical [1] - 21:11

Medium [1] - 31:18

meet [31] - 14:11, 14:22, 30:4, 30:13, 38:25, 47:16, 59:4, 62:11, 80:23, 80:25, 83:12, 84:15, 88:11, 90:24, 91:14, 92:17, 94:20, 95:3, 95:10, 95:17, 97:1, 97:4, 97:20, 98:7, 98:21, 100:21, 101:5, 101:24, 102:10, 102:12 meet-and-confer [12] - 80:25, 84:15,

91:14, 92:17, 94:20, 95:3, 95:17, 97:1,

97:4, 98:21, 102:12

meet-and-confers [12] - 30:4, 30:13, 80:23, 83:12, 88:11, 95:10, 97:20, 98:7, 100:21, 101:5, 101:24, 102:10

meeting [3] - 28:14, 43:12, 44:20 meetings [1] - 28:5 Melissa [5] - 2:11, 5:3, 41:8, 42:5, 42:21 member [1] - 18:17 memorialize [1] - 74:17 memorialized [1] - 73:7 memos [8] - 28:3, 37:22, 58:11, 58:15, 62:9, 62:13, 87:5, 99:3 Menesque [2] - 37:7, 55:18 mention [2] - 8:13, 97:18 mentioned [6] - 7:17, 39:19, 88:7, 90:3, 93:18. 98:14 MERKL [1] - 1:21 mess [2] - 17:19, 38:12 message [3] - 22:3, 64:9, 69:3 messages [9] - 20:14, 22:5, 31:9, 63:23, 64:6, 90:9, 95:23, 96:12, 97:8 met [6] - 6:18, 6:20, 9:15, 72:11, 75:19, 95:12 method [1] - 43:25 Michele [1] - 3:9 microphone [1] - 57:22 middle [3] - 28:18, 80:8, 93:9 midst [1] - 99:1 might [10] - 5:18, 45:5, 61:7, 61:18, 63:13, 92:23, 95:1, 95:7, 98:16, 103:20 mind [2] - 25:12, 57:23 minimize [1] - 87:20 minimum [1] - 38:23 minor [2] - 8:4, 66:21 minute [3] - 68:8, 69:19, 100:18 mistreated [1] - 12:2 misunderstood [1] - 12:18 mixed [1] - 51:2 MLuccheseEDNY@gmail.com [1] -3:12 mom [1] - 82:7 moment [1] - 47:7 month [1] - 60:16 months [4] - 26:15, 28:4, 28:9, 94:8 moral [1] - 61:9 morass [1] - 23:25 morning [9] - 4:2, 4:10, 4:12, 4:17, 4:21, 4:25, 5:4, 5:7, 71:6 MORRISON [1] - 2:20 Morvillo [1] - 5:1

MORVILLO [1] - 2:11

100:5, 100:23, 102:6

motion-to-compel [1] - 102:6

mother [1] - 79:5

most [5] - 13:22, 24:7, 34:1, 41:6, 89:16

14:7, 15:5, 19:10, 25:13, 32:9, 32:16,

89:7, 89:9, 89:14, 89:17, 89:25, 96:13,

motion [35] - 8:21, 9:22, 12:24, 13:4,

33:11, 36:15, 36:17, 37:23, 40:18,

41:22, 42:1, 53:5, 56:1, 62:5, 65:9,

96:16, 96:17, 96:19, 97:15, 98:24,

motions [15] - 5:15, 5:17, 6:21, 9:2,

must [3] - 7:20, 41:20, 95:13 myriad [1] - 36:7

13:15, 13:16, 18:21, 36:13, 36:17, 43:14, 43:15, 43:20, 44:4, 89:11, motivations [2] - 60:15, 70:13 motive [2] - 31:1, 69:12 move [6] - 44:7, 44:15, 44:16, 45:12, 56:5, 85:5 moving [1] - 45:6 **MR** [90] - 4:10, 4:12, 5:4, 7:16, 10:24, 11:17, 12:5, 12:13, 12:17, 13:1, 13:4, 13:7, 13:10, 15:5, 15:8, 15:14, 15:19, 15:22, 15:25, 16:10, 17:1, 17:3, 17:8, 33:4, 33:6, 33:13, 33:17, 34:11, 34:18, 35:1, 35:4, 35:6, 35:23, 36:12, 36:23, 37:15, 38:3, 38:6, 39:24, 40:1, 43:10, 45:2, 45:16, 46:23, 47:2, 47:10, 48:14, 49:14, 49:17, 49:19, 49:21, 50:5, 50:7, 50:10, 50:15, 50:19, 50:23, 51:10, 51:16, 51:20, 51:25, 52:4, 52:8, 52:11, 52:14, 52:18, 53:10, 53:14, 54:1, 54:6, 54:9, 54:12, 55:2, 55:9, 56:9, 63:16, 63:19, 68:7, 72:23, 83:22, 84:11, 87:1, 87:8, 87:22, 87:24, 90:20, 90:22, 93:4, 93:9, 93:12 MS [64] - 4:14, 4:17, 4:21, 4:25, 17:23, 19:21, 20:22, 20:25, 23:17, 24:25, 27:11, 27:14, 32:10, 33:21, 33:24, 37:14, 37:21, 37:25, 38:17, 39:2, 39:23, 40:3, 40:17, 40:23, 43:4, 57:5, 57:8, 57:14, 57:17, 58:16, 59:4, 59:6, 59:7, 59:24, 60:8, 62:25, 63:13, 64:17, 64:24, 65:4, 66:2, 66:4, 66:7, 66:22, 67:15, 68:10, 69:21, 70:5, 72:2, 75:4, 78:16, 78:18, 91:20, 91:22, 93:8, 93:17, 100:13, 100:18, 100:20, 101:4, 101:8, 102:8, 102:17, 102:19 mud [2] - 61:21, 72:19 multi [1] - 24:14 multi-hydra-headed [1] - 24:14 murder [1] - 11:20

Ν

nail [1] - 70:13

NAJMI[8] - 2:23, 2:25, 87:24, 90:20, 90:22, 93:4, 93:9, 93:12 najmi [1] - 92:16 Najmi [3] - 57:11, 87:23, 90:3 name [13] - 23:3, 27:1, 31:21, 39:25, 46:1, 57:7, 61:21, 63:24, 78:10, 92:3, 99:17, 100:5, 100:9 named [7] - 40:15, 74:16, 78:8, 78:12, 86:5, 86:9, 95:23 names [6] - 5:10, 20:2, 20:5, 62:20, 99:8, 99:10 narrow [10] - 6:19, 29:4, 30:18, 44:16, 44:21, 56:4, 58:17, 62:7, 90:24, 97:1 narrowed [1] - 10:1

narrowing [3] - 8:14, 9:1, 72:6 nature [1] - 76:13 naught [1] - 27:20 necessarily [4] - 12:5, 45:8, 45:9, 51:8 necessary [1] - 36:10 need [41] - 8:16, 10:18, 16:18, 18:19, 18:21, 19:11, 22:25, 23:5, 23:9, 24:12, 24:13, 24:20, 25:5, 25:11, 34:16, 39:7, 42:4, 42:7, 42:11, 43:2, 44:15, 46:15, 46:16, 47:8, 48:5, 48:6, 53:4, 53:6, 53:7, 56:13, 56:20, 65:2, 69:11, 82:13, 84:6, 90:18, 91:9, 98:8, 100:16, 103:3, needed [3] - 14:11, 18:12, 39:1 needing [1] - 23:15 needs [4] - 7:11, 16:22, 18:8, 96:5 negotiate [2] - 42:10, 43:4 negotiated [1] - 42:16 negotiating [1] - 42:17 never [19] - 12:20, 35:7, 59:16, 65:1, 65:4, 72:10, 72:11, 73:2, 73:19, 73:20, 75:19, 75:20, 88:5, 93:24, 93:25, 96:22, 98:13, 99:17 nevertheless [2] - 75:21, 76:17 NEW [2] - 1:1, 1:8 new [1] - 18:16 New [28] - 1:6, 1:24, 2:2, 2:6, 2:8, 2:9, 2:12, 2:15, 2:18, 2:21, 2:24, 3:3, 3:6, 3:11, 4:5, 5:5, 10:16, 43:7, 45:1, 45:9 newspaper [1] - 75:14 next [2] - 57:4, 71:8 nobody [1] - 56:2 non [4] - 27:25, 57:14, 66:14, 91:8 non-categorical [1] - 91:8 non-disclosure [1] - 27:25 non-party [2] - 57:14, 66:14 none [5] - 18:12, 28:2, 31:9, 32:3, 60:19 nonparties [11] - 9:6, 10:2, 14:14, 34:2, 38:19, 39:14, 44:7, 44:8, 79:7, 83:13, 94:15 **nonparty** [11] - 4:14, 13:18, 66:15, 77:4, 81:8, 81:16, 82:7, 88:5, 93:19, 95:10, 98:22 nonparty's [2] - 83:8, 98:18 noon [4] - 15:24, 53:1, 53:2, 68:6 Noonan [1] - 4:23 notable [1] - 85:25 notably [1] - 7:6 note [1] - 73:18 noted [2] - 6:13, 70:14 **notes** [3] - 87:5, 87:11, 89:3 nothing [19] - 31:17, 41:15, 42:4, 54:19, 61:6, 70:17, 73:1, 74:6, 74:17, 74:19, 77:5, 77:16, 81:24, 82:4, 86:5, 86:15, 92:11, 97:8, 97:15 notice [1] - 41:2 notion [1] - 65:23 notwithstanding [2] - 41:13, 41:17 **number** [10] - 5:15, 7:25, 30:4, 35:12,

35:13, 36:22, 42:19, 42:22, 78:11,

83:10 Number [1] - 72:25 numerous [1] - 9:13 NY [1] - 2:21

0

OAG [4] - 94:15, 95:5, 95:23, 99:3 oath [1] - 49:9 object [2] - 62:17, 92:3 objecting [3] - 13:8, 13:10, 13:12 objection [2] - 58:7, 99:9 objections [5] - 13:12, 16:2, 40:4, 85:4, 88:24 obligation [1] - 34:11 obligations [2] - 9:14, 22:17 observe [1] - 85:23 obviously [8] - 13:11, 16:24, 17:13, 57:20, 62:18, 67:22, 89:8, 103:19 occasion [1] - 90:4 occasionally [1] - 62:21 occurred [1] - 78:1 ocean [1] - 67:17 Ocean [1] - 9:20 **OF** [3] - 1:1, 1:20, 2:23 offer [1] - 35:10 offered [3] - 8:18, 18:24, 35:11 Office [29] - 6:1, 14:21, 15:24, 18:15, 23:16, 25:4, 31:4, 38:2, 38:5, 38:25, 39:4, 39:12, 39:15, 39:18, 56:12, 56:21, 58:8, 58:10, 58:19, 58:23, 58:25, 60:4, 62:9, 62:14, 87:5, 94:13,

78:6, 78:23, 81:11, 92:1, 94:11

OFFICE [1] - 2:23

official [1] - 6:5

Official [1] - 3:10

often [1] - 54:16

old [1] - 85:1

Old [1] - 16:17

94:24, 99:12, 103:22

office [9] - 4:16, 53:20, 77:9, 77:12,

once [9] - 24:3, 28:1, 64:12, 65:10, 83:1, 97:8, 97:14, 98:7, 98:14

one [69] - 8:1, 8:13, 8:24, 9:3, 9:17, 9:20, 12:21, 15:2, 16:3, 17:24, 19:14, 20:3, 20:8, 23:25, 24:1, 24:18, 24:19, 25:15, 26:4, 28:5, 29:8, 31:13, 33:6, 36:10, 36:13, 36:17, 37:4, 38:13, 40:8, 40:17, 43:15, 43:23, 44:2, 45:10, 46:1, 46:4, 47:22, 49:13, 53:19, 54:3, 54:15, 54:24, 57:24, 58:4, 65:1, 68:8, 68:11, 68:15, 68:20, 69:11, 69:19, 72:15, 73:25, 74:16, 78:9, 79:4, 82:19, 84:23, 85:1, 89:6, 90:21, 91:12, 91:22, 91:23, 93:4, 93:21, 94:7, 97:18, 100:18

ones [1] - 72:17 open [1] - 63:9 openness [1] - 59:7 opinion [1] - 56:23 opponent [2] - 53:20, 53:21

opportunity [8] - 7:17, 9:1, 16:20, 33:14, 41:24, 72:24, 87:12, 98:15 oppose [1] - 12:12 opposed [2] - 12:22, 12:23 opposing [2] - 16:1, 16:7 opt [1] - 28:1 options [1] - 53:13 order [17] - 16:22, 34:17, 44:15, 56:22, 82:17, 84:7, 84:14, 84:17, 84:18, 84:22, 85:13, 85:15, 86:19, 87:17, 100:4, 100:6, 100:10 ordered [1] - 84:23 originally [1] - 34:6 ourself [1] - 45:3 ourselves [1] - 23:20 outcome [1] - 91:18 outline [1] - 21:18 outlined [1] - 47:24 outreach [1] - 95:24 outside [3] - 46:18, 60:10, 62:3 outspoken [3] - 75:12, 77:23, 88:17 outstanding [1] - 36:18 overall [1] - 7:4 overcome [2] - 10:22, 12:2 overkill [2] - 15:15, 16:12 overlap [2] - 73:20, 73:22 overlapped [1] - 92:2 overlapping [1] - 47:21 own [8] - 9:13, 23:10, 24:4, 25:10, 31:15, 51:6, 85:10, 86:18

Р

package [1] - 88:19 pact [1] - 50:2 page [2] - 54:15, 71:8 pages [15] - 22:15, 31:9, 31:12, 39:4, 39:8, 73:7, 75:23, 76:1, 76:7, 76:12, 79:12, 91:19, 94:5, 94:7 pale [1] - 14:25 Palermo [2] - 5:5, 43:8 PALERMO [4] - 2:9, 5:4, 43:10, 45:2 pandemic [1] - 73:5 paper [1] - 20:4 papers [12] - 7:9, 20:20, 35:2, 59:21, 61:22, 66:19, 67:7, 67:8, 100:22, 101:23, 102:3 parade [1] - 11:14 paragraph [1] - 74:16 paragraphs [4] - 18:2, 23:2, 23:4, 27:1 parameters [3] - 7:2, 55:24, 86:19 paraphrasing [1] - 13:25 Parish [1] - 63:24 PARK [2] - 63:16, 63:19 part [26] - 6:16, 12:24, 14:10, 15:21, 19:14, 25:13, 29:9, 29:14, 29:17, 29:23, 29:24, 32:11, 34:1, 34:7, 46:21, 69:15, 73:11, 75:22, 78:2, 89:9, 89:15,

participate [2] - 41:10, 41:16 participated [1] - 41:22 participating [1] - 41:14 particular [6] - 18:17, 52:9, 54:21, 64:4, 64:12, 89:22 particularly [1] - 85:8 parties [50] - 4:8, 5:9, 5:11, 5:12, 6:17, 7:2, 14:13, 14:17, 14:22, 32:11, 32:13, 32:17, 36:5, 36:25, 37:2, 38:16, 38:23, 40:4, 40:5, 41:7, 41:18, 42:12, 42:19, 42:25, 44:6, 44:19, 47:17, 56:3, 56:6, 56:16, 56:20, 57:13, 58:4, 59:12, 60:21, 61:1, 61:24, 68:1, 70:8, 72:5, 72:16, 74:7, 79:6, 83:25, 86:4, 86:5, 89:19, 89:22, 91:10, 102:21 partner [1] - 99:22 party [27] - 2:15, 2:18, 2:21, 2:24, 3:2, 3:5, 13:6, 14:6, 15:2, 17:16, 31:24, 36:2, 36:24, 43:2, 50:2, 57:14, 58:22, 64:6, 66:14, 66:21, 67:19, 69:24, 73:18, 73:19, 81:22, 82:1, 88:5 past [3] - 59:11, 60:16, 99:22 payroll [1] - 28:12 Pearl [1] - 2:18 pending [10] - 5:15, 5:17, 9:2, 14:7, 18:21, 40:18, 84:1, 89:11, 96:14, 96:16 penultimate [1] - 95:16 people [27] - 10:14, 10:20, 11:21, 12:1, 12:7, 12:9, 12:15, 19:22, 20:1, 24:14, 26:18, 41:5, 43:17, 43:18, 48:5, 48:8, 50:18, 51:5, 55:5, 58:12, 68:22, 89:16, 90:14, 90:23, 91:15, 95:25, 103:20 per [2] - 51:22, 52:1 perceive [1] - 25:2 percent [2] - 19:25 perfect [1] - 35:16 perfectly [3] - 15:10, 16:5, 37:3 perhaps [5] - 49:1, 49:23, 53:6, 60:21, 65:20 perimeter [2] - 11:25, 75:7 period [1] - 93:22 periods [1] - 88:13 perjured [1] - 48:20 perjury [1] - 48:19 permission [1] - 89:24 permitted [1] - 43:18 perpetrator [2] - 48:24, 49:4 perpetrator's [1] - 7:21 Perrotta [11] - 20:13, 20:15, 20:16, 20:18, 21:4, 34:21, 35:7, 35:11, 35:13, 48:14, 48:17 Perrotta's [2] - 21:20, 22:6 Perry [11] - 4:14, 7:22, 10:12, 47:24, 57:21, 58:2, 63:19, 69:18, 69:19, 70:4 PERRY [19] - 2:14, 2:16, 4:14, 57:17, 58:16, 59:4, 59:7, 59:24, 60:8, 62:25, 65:4, 66:2, 66:4, 66:7, 66:22, 67:15, 69:21, 70:5, 72:2

person [9] - 25:2, 59:24, 60:13, 64:11,

90:10, 102:4, 102:5, 103:8

64:12, 64:15, 66:17, 82:25, 99:18 pose [1] - 17:24 probable [1] - 54:16 personal [11] - 25:5, 26:1, 26:8, 62:18, posed [2] - 17:25, 62:8 problem [20] - 6:16, 14:19, 15:25, 25:23, 73:14, 73:17, 74:5, 90:1, 99:20, 99:22, 34:7, 35:17, 40:11, 43:13, 44:18, posing [1] - 24:2 99:25 46:19, 49:6, 55:22, 58:20, 60:8, 72:2, **position** [12] - 45:10, 46:24, 47:8, 58:14, personally [1] - 24:8 80:19, 82:11, 82:15, 87:9, 87:15 63:10, 64:25, 67:11, 70:5, 81:11, persons [1] - 90:9 81:12, 87:4, 90:8 problematic [1] - 29:17 perspective [2] - 84:9, 99:13 positioning [1] - 92:19 problems [2] - 43:14, 44:4 pertaining [2] - 10:21, 84:4 positive [2] - 42:16, 42:18 procedural [1] - 89:23 pest [1] - 14:19 possesses [1] - 77:14 proceeding [1] - 45:4 PETRINO [1] - 2:4 possible [3] - 17:11, 66:11, 91:10 Proceedings [1] - 3:13 Petrino [1] - 4:18 possibly [3] - 72:13, 96:24, 98:1 process [23] - 5:15, 5:23, 6:6, 6:19, petty [1] - 8:4 Post [1] - 75:14 10:19, 33:3, 38:13, 38:18, 43:21, 44:8, phone [28] - 9:9, 9:20, 14:23, 14:24, 44:24, 44:25, 47:18, 51:15, 53:5, 56:5, post [1] - 94:24 71:2, 85:1, 85:4, 86:18, 91:12, 95:11, 20:18, 21:2, 21:5, 21:22, 34:22, 34:23, potential [3] - 67:13, 84:12, 85:11 35:11, 35:12, 35:19, 48:9, 70:15, potentially [2] - 77:17, 90:17 produce [16] - 14:9, 23:25, 31:8, 35:11, 70:16, 97:24, 98:3, 98:8, 98:12, 98:14, PR [1] - 11:2 56:11, 56:17, 59:14, 59:17, 64:3, 65:8, 98:15, 98:18, 98:19 practically [1] - 17:21 phones [3] - 20:18, 21:23, 22:16 67:1, 77:17, 77:20, 80:14, 96:20, practice [5] - 15:5, 32:16, 33:11, 98:24, 101:12 **photo** [1] - 82:2 102:6 produced [43] - 3:13, 8:22, 14:9, 14:20, photographs [1] - 81:21 pre [3] - 32:15, 33:11, 89:17 14:21, 18:14, 21:24, 22:5, 22:14, photos [1] - 81:23 pre-litigate [1] - 32:15 25:22, 25:23, 31:8, 31:12, 31:15, 32:3, picked [1] - 35:8 pre-litigated [1] - 33:11 39:3, 39:17, 42:24, 56:11, 56:17, pictures [1] - 80:6 pre-motion [1] - 89:17 58:18, 58:19, 58:24, 59:2, 60:3, 75:23, piece [1] - 49:25 precedent [1] - 67:18 76:1, 76:7, 76:13, 77:7, 77:8, 77:12, pieces [1] - 14:11 precisely [2] - 25:10, 38:17 79:12, 79:13, 79:23, 94:4, 98:12, Pittsford [1] - 2:9 precluded [1] - 71:4 101:1, 101:6 place [8] - 48:16, 67:4, 72:18, 81:11, Preet [1] - 54:23 producing [5] - 18:12, 25:23, 59:8, 83:15, 84:14, 100:2, 100:4 prefer [4] - 18:5, 24:14, 26:20, 29:22 80:19, 101:25 Plaintiff [3] - 1:5, 1:13, 1:23 preference [1] - 16:25 product [1] - 17:19 plaintiff [12] - 4:9, 6:7, 6:17, 21:22, prejudice [2] - 41:6, 41:7 production [11] - 9:17, 31:17, 39:10, 39:20, 61:7, 67:19, 78:12, 93:19, prejudicial [1] - 51:8 45:5, 64:5, 66:8, 94:12, 94:15, 94:18, 98:21, 103:12, 103:14 prep [1] - 19:6 94:23, 95:5 plaintiff's [11] - 16:16, 17:25, 18:19, prepare [2] - 23:1, 24:5 program [1] - 26:13 22:11, 27:19, 29:12, 29:18, 41:19, prepared [7] - 10:3, 21:19, 36:23, 36:24, proof [2] - 7:3, 15:8 44:12, 71:5, 88:8 56:17, 91:9, 97:12 proper [1] - 21:6 plaintiffs [1] - 33:19 present [7] - 5:9, 8:8, 16:18, 34:8, proportional [1] - 74:22 plan [3] - 16:19, 33:2, 51:12 55:24, 68:22, 92:19 proportionality [4] - 60:9, 60:10, 72:15, plane [2] - 69:15, 69:17 presentation [1] - 71:6 planning [1] - 15:17 presently [2] - 6:24, 84:14 proportionate [6] - 81:8, 95:7, 97:16, play [4] - 16:11, 68:21, 84:9, 86:23 **press** [10] - 25:25, 39:5, 66:23, 74:1, 98:2, 98:16, 98:20 plays [1] - 27:9 76:18, 80:4, 80:8, 87:19, 92:19 proposal [6] - 38:18, 39:13, 43:8, 43:11, Plaza [2] - 3:2, 3:10 pressed [1] - 12:12 45:4, 45:12 plead [1] - 71:5 pressing [1] - 36:7 proposing [1] - 19:12 plenty [2] - 60:25, 83:4 presumably [2] - 46:1, 80:14 protect [2] - 11:8, 100:4 PLLC [4] - 2:1, 2:8, 4:19, 5:5 presume [1] - 82:16 protected [1] - 58:12 point [25] - 9:20, 15:14, 16:12, 17:14, presuming [1] - 87:16 protections [1] - 100:3 22:24, 30:2, 46:5, 47:11, 48:22, 51:21, pretty [8] - 5:22, 13:19, 13:20, 27:8, protective [10] - 82:17, 84:7, 84:14, 52:17, 55:2, 65:5, 66:22, 68:11, 69:21, 30:9, 30:22, 48:19, 52:2 84:17, 84:18, 84:22, 85:13, 85:15, 73:1, 80:3, 81:12, 82:5, 91:22, 94:19, **previewing** [1] - 87:5 86:19, 87:17 95:5, 101:25 previously [3] - 87:19, 90:4, 91:1 proven [1] - 69:21 points [4] - 18:7, 20:7, 63:14, 92:16 primarily [1] - 76:2 provide [6] - 59:3, 77:5, 77:6, 90:19, poker [1] - 68:21 principle [1] - 87:15 94:3, 100:25 **POLICE** [1] - 1:8 private [2] - 82:18 provided [10] - 20:14, 35:4, 38:24, police [1] - 11:1 privately [1] - 90:1 58:10, 73:14, 74:4, 74:7, 76:4, 78:4, Police [8] - 2:9, 4:6, 5:6, 10:16, 21:9, privilege [11] - 88:15, 88:22, 88:25, 86:20 43:7, 45:1, 45:9 90:2, 90:5, 90:6, 90:12, 90:18, 90:19, provides [1] - 6:24 political [2] - 28:18, 60:15 91:11 providing [1] - 43:11 portion [2] - 51:12, 78:5 privileged [2] - 28:1, 91:8 proving [3] - 7:15, 15:3, 72:10 portions [3] - 49:16, 49:20, 49:22 privileges [2] - 58:13, 91:2 proximity [1] - 47:21

prudent [1] - 89:12 PSU [5] - 10:16, 18:17, 20:13, 46:9, 93:24 public [18] - 53:20, 59:22, 60:1, 60:7, 66:25, 67:11, 68:19, 68:24, 69:1, 69:7, $73{:}10,\,74{:}18,\,78{:}3,\,79{:}9,\,95{:}25,\,99{:}18$ publication [1] - 92:8 publicized [1] - 99:18 publicly [10] - 19:17, 27:3, 73:8, 75:12, 75:13, 76:6, 77:23, 77:25, 87:18, 88:7 published [1] - 31:17 pudding [1] - 15:8 pulled [1] - 78:23 purported [1] - 76:20 purportedly [1] - 75:10 **purpose** [1] - 21:6 purposes [2] - 67:14, 92:19 pursuant [1] - 59:14 pursue [2] - 43:1, 43:2 **push** [1] - 18:19 pushed [1] - 21:8 put [12] - 20:11, 30:5, 32:1, 32:4, 33:7, 34:10, 37:1, 57:18, 61:13, 65:16, 72:18, 103:11 putting [2] - 33:2, 47:18

Q

quagmire [1] - 5:21 quash [9] - 12:24, 62:5, 89:7, 89:14, 96:13, 96:16, 96:17, 96:19, 97:15 quashed [1] - 98:24 questioned [2] - 19:3, 19:15 questioning [1] - 29:15 questions [16] - 29:21, 34:14, 51:2, 53:1, 56:19, 58:3, 61:4, 62:4, 74:23, 77:16, 82:10, 83:24, 84:10, 87:2, 87:3, quickly [1] - 45:6 quite [7] - 7:25, 23:9, 25:24, 33:25, 44:24, 53:23, 103:19 quote [1] - 82:22 quote/unquote [1] - 65:6 QUZACK [1] - 2:16 Quzack [1] - 4:15

R

rabbit [2] - 69:22, 70:11
rails [2] - 102:14, 102:15
raise [1] - 68:11
raised [2] - 61:4, 84:2
ramifications [1] - 5:24
rare [2] - 32:17, 34:16
rarely [1] - 26:7
re [7] - 22:18, 22:23, 34:5, 47:19, 48:6, 60:23, 69:22
re-litigate [2] - 22:23, 69:22
re-reviewed [1] - 22:18
re-traumatize [1] - 47:19

re-traumatized [2] - 34:5, 60:23 reach [1] - 90:9 reached [3] - 15:2, 35:7 reaching [3] - 22:6, 22:9, 96:1 read [1] - 50:17 ready [1] - 18:9 reality [3] - 18:6, 19:2, 29:18 really [23] - 16:18, 28:21, 34:9, 43:15, 43:18, 43:25, 44:22, 51:2, 51:14, 53:3, 68:1, 70:6, 72:13, 77:4, 81:1, 81:15, 83:16, 86:16, 88:16, 95:18, 97:2, 102:22, 103:8 reason [16] - 21:10, 23:17, 28:13, 28:19, 31:25, 41:2, 46:12, 56:14, 63:22, 64:2, 68:18, 76:20, 77:21, 91:25, 102:4, 102:5 reasonable [7] - 25:2, 27:8, 72:17, 83:3, 85:17, 91:16, 101:16 reasonably [1] - 38:7 reasons [11] - 23:11, 26:4, 35:20, 40:8, 60:6, 61:10, 65:2, 67:3, 68:15, 69:11, 89:25 receipt [1] - 86:19 received [9] - 22:3, 25:7, 79:11, 83:14, 85:3, 88:2, 90:9, 94:25, 95:23 receiving [1] - 103:18 recent [1] - 13:22 recently [2] - 5:20, 39:7 recess [1] - 103:24 recitation [2] - 100:21, 100:23 reckoning [1] - 25:8 recognize [3] - 36:14, 36:16, 57:11 recollections [1] - 102:10 recommended [1] - 23:23 reconsideration [1] - 37:23 reconvene [1] - 103:23 record [14] - 4:9, 6:10, 6:24, 13:20, 16:18, 18:7, 21:1, 48:2, 53:20, 55:24, 57:19, 64:20, 66:25, 103:10 recorded [1] - 3:13 records [32] - 9:9, 14:23, 14:24, 21:2, 21:5, 21:12, 27:10, 27:12, 27:18, 34:22, 34:23, 35:12, 35:15, 35:19, 37:18, 37:20, 48:9, 59:19, 70:14, 70:15, 70:16, 97:24, 98:4, 98:8, 98:12, 98:13, 98:14, 98:15, 98:18 recreate [3] - 6:8, 23:10, 23:12 redacted [7] - 19:18, 20:1, 62:18, 62:23, 73:17, 78:5, 98:12 redactions [8] - 62:19, 63:3, 82:11, 99:6, 99:10, 99:16, 99:17, 100:2 reduplicate [1] - 23:15 reference [3] - 31:7, 74:4, 86:3 referenced [2] - 23:4, 27:1 references [1] - 73:17 referred [2] - 63:19, 78:12 reforms [1] - 88:20 refuses [1] - 8:17 refusing [3] - 18:8, 20:8, 64:3 regard [12] - 58:14, 78:25, 84:10, 84:25,

85:13, 85:24, 86:3, 86:14, 87:8, 87:11, 90:2. 92:18 regarding [5] - 15:6, 52:20, 58:8, 80:16, 84:16 regardless [2] - 55:12, 80:17 rejected [2] - 18:24, 59:15 relate [4] - 19:13, 70:1, 73:21, 73:23 related [8] - 16:2, 75:10, 76:1, 76:8, 76:18, 76:19, 86:1, 90:15 relating [2] - 42:21, 64:5 relations [3] - 63:22, 64:7, 65:6 relationship [7] - 28:6, 28:7, 68:13, 69:2, 69:5, 69:25, 81:20 relatively [1] - 39:8 release [8] - 13:23, 56:18, 58:7, 58:14, 62:17, 73:13, 74:3, 78:3 released [2] - 19:18, 25:18 releasing [1] - 99:2 relevance [19] - 7:4, 11:23, 12:11, 12:24, 13:3, 16:23, 20:6, 22:20, 24:3, 26:21, 29:5, 32:19, 60:9, 67:13, 76:20, 77:21, 88:9, 89:9, 99:25 relevant [34] - 11:22, 30:14, 32:23, 45:8, 49:3, 49:24, 60:7, 68:18, 69:6, 70:20, 70:24, 71:1, 72:10, 75:22, 76:17, 77:7, 77:18, 79:19, 79:20, 79:21, 81:23, 91:23, 92:23, 92:25, 94:3, 95:1, 95:7, 95:14, 97:16, 98:2, 98:5, 98:16, 98:19, 101.18 reliance [2] - 10:9, 41:1 relief [1] - 29:3 remain [3] - 62:18, 100:2, 100:4 remarks [1] - 75:1 remember [3] - 20:5, 36:16, 64:17 reminded [1] - 82:13 removed [1] - 28:11 removes [1] - 41:1 removing [1] - 99:10 renege [1] - 97:3 reneging [1] - 101:10 renegotiated [2] - 39:16, 84:15 repeat [1] - 56:10 repeated [3] - 8:5, 25:1, 25:20 repeatedly [6] - 7:9, 23:19, 24:22, 79:16, 94:17, 101:17 reply [2] - 43:17, 100:22 report [37] - 7:10, 7:18, 22:22, 22:25, 23:7, 23:10, 23:12, 29:6, 29:7, 29:12, 29:13, 29:17, 29:24, 31:3, 37:10, 37:11, 38:8, 49:16, 49:23, 50:2, 50:17, 51:12, 52:21, 52:22, 53:8, 53:17, 53:25, 54:4, 74:3, 76:15, 79:3, 95:23, 95:24, 96:9 Reporter [2] - 3:9, 3:10 reports [3] - 6:25, 10:8, 12:16 repose [1] - 61:13 represent [12] - 4:19, 5:3, 39:24, 57:5, 72:24, 77:10, 78:19, 83:20, 87:25, 93:18, 99:11, 99:12 representation [1] - 22:10

representations [1] - 102:25 Rule [11] - 7:14, 10:8, 10:22, 12:2, 12:3, separately [1] - 84:6 represented [2] - 10:7, 32:21 13:7, 49:18, 51:8, 60:9, 70:24 September [2] - 1:7, 18:23 rule [6] - 16:8, 16:11, 52:3, 54:20, 55:23 request [4] - 13:13, 17:5, 37:17, 59:9 series [3] - 22:9, 27:23, 28:18 ruled [1] - 97:14 requests [8] - 7:7, 40:4, 42:19, 59:15, serious [2] - 27:2, 27:5 rules [7] - 6:23, 37:2, 43:18, 43:22, 79:18, 80:22, 85:3, 86:7 served [6] - 30:21, 73:4, 74:9, 74:10, 43:25, 89:15, 90:1 require [2] - 8:3, 43:22 85:2, 85:5 requirement [1] - 41:11 ruling [2] - 87:6, 96:16 service [1] - 73:10 requiring [1] - 89:22 rulings [5] - 40:22, 40:24, 52:25, 84:12, services [1] - 90:14 resigned [2] - 28:14, 60:14 85.12 set [4] - 40:6, 70:9, 87:7, 99:15 resolution [1] - 65:15 run [1] - 93:10 setting [1] - 11:24 settlement [1] - 43:5 resolve [7] - 10:3, 10:19, 40:20, 40:25, 43:13, 65:17, 84:6 S seven [2] - 28:9, 82:23 resolved [7] - 9:16, 9:17, 9:22, 10:2, several [5] - 29:9, 29:16, 30:23, 63:25, S.D.N.Y [1] - 83:25 44:3, 84:4, 89:13 69:10 sad [1] - 96:1 resources [2] - 79:7, 95:11 sexual [27] - 9:8, 13:13, 26:6, 28:7, sadly [1] - 5:21 respect [34] - 14:5, 20:7, 20:10, 21:21, 28:22, 30:25, 41:3, 41:16, 41:23, 42:7, Salzman [3] - 57:14, 93:15, 103:17 23:7, 23:8, 26:22, 27:15, 27:21, 30:24, 42:14, 45:22, 46:7, 51:6, 52:6, 55:17, **SALZMAN**[3] - 3:4, 57:14, 93:17 34:8, 37:10, 38:19, 46:12, 48:22, 59:18, 59:25, 61:5, 64:20, 67:2, 69:2, sat [3] - 41:14, 45:24, 73:15 51:21, 62:6, 63:16, 64:19, 65:10, 69:25, 75:11, 79:2, 88:6, 99:24 satisfaction [1] - 58:25 68:12, 70:3, 79:17, 82:10, 82:11, sexually [5] - 24:22, 26:5, 27:4, 27:24, 82:19, 88:9, 88:13, 88:15, 89:1, 89:3, save [1] - 91:19 65:1 100:20, 101:2, 101:9 saw [3] - 28:24, 42:13, 64:12 shamed [1] - 87:18 respectfully [1] - 8:15 scenario [1] - 81:14 shared [1] - 75:24 respecting [1] - 16:15 scheduled [3] - 15:24, 18:10, 38:5 shedding [1] - 60:5 respond [3] - 43:16, 88:23, 100:7 **SCHNELL** [1] - 3:5 **SHER** [1] - 2:5 school [1] - 14:24 responded [1] - 96:10 Sher [1] - 4:22 responding [1] - 38:6 **scope** [11] - 11:6, 13:14, 14:5, 19:2, shirked [2] - 8:23, 22:17 response [5] - 42:24, 45:17, 57:25, 44:12, 47:2, 48:23, 53:8, 54:19, 65:16, shit [1] - 69:5 97.1 58:5. 86:10 shit-follower [1] - 69:5 responses [1] - 42:8 screaming [1] - 61:12 shock [1] - 28:17 responsibilities [1] - 8:23 se [2] - 51:22, 52:1 short [1] - 103:20 responsive [6] - 21:25, 22:19, 30:11, search [2] - 76:4, 76:11 **show** [3] - 11:15, 49:5, 53:21 30:15, 42:20, 101:19 seated [1] - 4:3 showing [2] - 76:13, 80:5 rest [1] - 61:12 Second [2] - 7:19, 51:21 **side** [3] - 10:13, 26:14, 32:4 rests [1] - 6:16 second [5] - 21:11, 37:5, 49:25, 68:18, sides [3] - 60:25, 65:21, 85:4 result [1] - 29:15 99:20 sideshow [1] - 65:5 secondly [1] - 101:9 retaliating [1] - 45:19 sigh [1] - 29:3 secretary [1] - 11:2 retaliation [2] - 24:6, 45:20 sign [1] - 27:25 retraumatized [1] - 74:11 **see** [18] - 5:9, 6:16, 16:19, 47:5, 49:10, signatory [1] - 17:18 53:11, 56:6, 56:14, 56:24, 62:11, retraumatizes [1] - 74:22 signed [1] - 68:23 review [6] - 77:20, 78:7, 87:12, 89:5, 65:20, 68:5, 79:25, 80:12, 81:12, significant [2] - 6:14, 34:14 91:2, 91:11 81:23, 87:10, 89:13 similar [6] - 15:1, 17:15, 32:24, 38:13, seek [5] - 10:19, 13:13, 65:13, 67:25, reviewed [1] - 22:18 38:15, 42:17 89:14 revisit [1] - 101:13 similarly [2] - 48:8, 87:11 seeking [13] - 7:1, 49:15, 50:22, 51:13, revisiting [1] - 52:25 simple [1] - 18:3 53:24, 58:12, 66:18, 71:7, 80:11, rich [1] - 33:1 simply [3] - 18:15, 22:11, 79:20 81:21, 91:5, 91:16, 100:17 Richard [5] - 2:12, 5:3, 41:9, 42:6, 42:21 sincere [1] - 32:12 seeks [2] - 6:4, 9:7 right-hand [1] - 12:1 single [15] - 6:7, 22:3, 35:24, 47:5, seem [2] - 53:13, 56:24 ripe [2] - 36:17, 65:25 48:24, 70:12, 78:21, 79:5, 82:7, 83:2, self [1] - 69:3 rise [1] - 4:1 83:5, 94:7, 94:21, 98:3, 98:19 self-deleting [1] - 69:3 risk [2] - 40:22, 40:23 sit [9] - 9:4, 9:5, 18:9, 18:10, 19:1, 19:3, senator [5] - 88:1, 88:14, 88:16, 89:1, Rita [1] - 4:17 19:15, 20:8, 24:1 **RITA**[1] - 2:3 sitting [4] - 18:3, 57:4, 57:22, 102:11 sense [3] - 62:12, 85:18, 85:21 Road [1] - 2:8 situated [1] - 91:4 sensible [4] - 15:10, 16:5, 35:16, 37:3 rock [2] - 47:5, 67:17 situation [3] - 5:21, 10:17, 76:25 sensitive [3] - 89:21, 99:14, 99:25 Rockefeller [1] - 3:2 six [2] - 24:17, 28:9 sensitivity [2] - 84:12, 85:11 role [4] - 27:9, 86:16, 86:17, 86:23 slept [2] - 9:8, 28:21 sent [4] - 46:1, 46:5, 69:3, 80:11 romantic [1] - 99:22 slights [1] - 8:4 separate [3] - 58:13, 67:5, 88:3 **RPR**[1] - 3:9 slow [1] - 91:12

small [3] - 44:2, 79:5, 91:1 status [4] - 4:5, 39:21, 39:22, 85:13 sufficient [1] - 42:2 smiling [1] - 80:6 STATUS[1] - 1:20 sufficiently [1] - 10:22 smoothly [1] - 85:10 stay [1] - 38:2 suggest [2] - 15:1, 41:15 **solution** [9] - 14:2, 14:8, 14:19, 15:1, stenography [1] - 3:13 suggested [2] - 38:13, 95:5 15:10, 16:5, 35:17, 37:3, 46:20 step [1] - 9:15 suggestion [7] - 17:15, 38:21, 38:22, solutions [3] - 34:1, 38:11, 102:14 Steph [1] - 64:9 56:22, 59:1, 60:21, 70:9 someone [2] - 9:8, 60:12 Stephanie [1] - 63:24 sui [1] - 15:19 sometimes [1] - 43:17 Stern [1] - 5:2 suit [1] - 73:20 Suite [1] - 3:5 somewhat [2] - 21:13, 25:9 still [7] - 14:7, 43:19, 51:25, 52:10, son [2] - 20:21, 20:23 62:18, 72:9, 103:3 summarily [1] - 18:24 soon [3] - 17:11, 25:17, 80:7 stop [6] - 6:23, 7:12, 13:18, 48:8, 65:12, summer [1] - 80:4 65:18 sun [1] - 48:10 soon-to-be [1] - 80:7 sorry [5] - 12:17, 27:13, 36:3, 39:25, stopped [1] - 36:16 superior [1] - 68:13 102:17 **Story** [1] - 31:18 supervisor [1] - 49:2 sort [12] - 11:5, 11:25, 14:15, 44:7, story [2] - 26:8, 46:8 support [4] - 75:10, 75:13, 76:3, 80:1 53:13, 56:3, 62:13, 66:21, 84:4, 89:18, stranger [1] - 81:4 supporter [1] - 77:23 98:25 strategic [1] - 48:6 suppose [3] - 15:9, 45:4, 62:10 sought [5] - 45:7, 70:15, 79:15, 79:25, strategically [1] - 33:8 **supposed** [3] - 55:6, 55:14, 94:20 81:15 strategy [5] - 6:13, 8:11, 34:7, 34:9, surely [1] - 85:17 source [1] - 53:21 56:3 surprised [2] - 32:21, 36:20 sources [1] - 33:1 **streamline** [1] - 26:21 surrounding [1] - 75:19 Southern [6] - 27:17, 39:20, 83:20, Street [6] - 2:2, 2:5, 2:15, 2:18, 2:21, suspect [1] - 19:10 84:5, 86:9, 86:12 25:19 swath [2] - 6:4, 34:25 speaking [5] - 7:10, 17:21, 80:4, 86:22, **strenuously** [1] - 66:11 swathes [2] - 19:22, 19:25 87:13 stressing [1] - 91:15 sworn [1] - 54:1 **specific** [14] - 9:25, 14:11, 14:22, 16:2, strike [2] - 25:13, 44:16 20:1, 46:9, 59:11, 62:20, 63:3, 82:10, strip [1] - 68:21 Т 83:9, 94:14, 95:6 strongly [2] - 19:10, 86:15 **specifically** [6] - 7:11, 8:11, 45:8, 59:8, table [5] - 17:14, 38:18, 53:13, 86:21, struggling [1] - 44:11 79:17, 86:1 stuck [3] - 26:21, 26:22, 29:1 specificity [2] - 96:23, 97:10 talks [2] - 20:17, 26:23 stuff [4] - 40:10, 47:20, 48:7, 101:14 spell [1] - 57:7 tangentially [1] - 77:6 subject [11] - 14:6, 36:13, 51:25, 57:21, spend [1] - 26:10 TARYN[1] - 1:21 65:8, 78:6, 82:16, 87:16, 89:10, 98:24 spoken [1] - 81:25 tee [1] - 100:8 subjected [1] - 83:2 staffers [2] - 20:2, 26:3 subpoena [32] - 9:8, 12:19, 12:21, teed [1] - 49:22 stake [3] - 5:16, 5:23, 56:8 21:15, 23:20, 23:21, 25:7, 25:17, telephone [1] - 20:19 stance [1] - 45:3 25:19, 27:17, 30:18, 30:20, 30:21, temporal [1] - 47:20 stand [1] - 16:24 30:22, 31:15, 63:14, 63:19, 63:21, ten [2] - 10:20, 24:14 standalone [1] - 73:24 64:18, 65:7, 74:9, 75:22, 76:17, 76:21, tendered [2] - 85:3, 85:14 standing [1] - 63:1 88:2, 88:10, 88:23, 91:5, 95:13, 97:1, tenor [1] - 34:2 stands [1] - 63:5 98:17, 98:23 tenth [1] - 24:13 starkly [1] - 102:9 subpoenaed [21] - 12:15, 17:4, 21:4, $\textbf{terms}\, {\tiny [10]} \textbf{-} 32:13,\, 55:19,\, 75:11,\, 79:25,\,$ start [7] - 58:2, 68:6, 83:14, 95:5, 31:4, 32:4, 34:21, 37:12, 37:18, 37:21, 91:4, 91:16, 92:17, 97:18, 99:2, 99:5 40:8, 60:17, 63:22, 64:2, 64:11, 64:13, 101:12, 101:21, 103:21 terrain [1] - 51:15 64:15, 75:9, 77:19, 94:2, 94:10, 97:23 started [4] - 13:20, 17:24, 36:15, 40:3 terribly [1] - 102:6 subpoenaing [4] - 14:23, 20:17, 48:9, **starting** [1] - 4:9 test [3] - 24:4, 52:1, 52:23 67:25 starts [1] - 74:15 testified [6] - 25:25, 46:14, 49:9, 55:10, subpoenas [24] - 9:12, 9:13, 12:9, 13:6, **STATE**[1] - 1:8 74:2, 79:8 21:6, 26:23, 26:24, 27:6, 34:25, 42:8, State [21] - 2:8, 2:18, 4:6, 5:6, 6:1, testifies [2] - 31:11, 31:12 42:10, 42:25, 45:7, 45:11, 58:5, 61:16, 10:16, 11:1, 11:4, 18:22, 21:9, 26:12, testify [4] - 20:16, 43:5, 46:13, 76:24 28:10, 43:7, 45:1, 45:9, 50:1, 57:2, 63:16, 63:18, 65:11, 74:11, 79:11, testifying [1] - 44:23 83:13, 102:21 68:14, 72:24, 75:7, 84:9 testimonies [1] - 48:2 substantive [2] - 81:2, 81:7 **state** [8] - 4:8, 21:13, 73:4, 88:1, 88:16, testimony [22] - 15:20, 16:6, 20:12, sudden [1] - 74:15 90:7, 93:6, 99:10 20:14, 24:20, 24:22, 25:17, 25:24, suddenly [1] - 97:9 statement [8] - 7:15, 43:22, 53:20, 34:25, 46:16, 54:1, 54:5, 55:9, 55:11, 61:14, 64:24, 67:20, 68:24, 69:1 sue [1] - 93:20 73:7, 74:18, 75:10, 83:2, 83:8, 87:9, sued [4] - 27:6, 27:16, 61:15, 73:19 statements [3] - 28:1, 59:23, 60:1 103:2, 103:4 suffered [1] - 11:15 **STATES**[2] - 1:1, 1:21 tests [1] - 68:1 suffering [2] - 41:6, 41:7 States [1] - 1:6 text [10] - 20:14, 22:3, 22:5, 22:9, 25:20,

31:9, 69:3, 80:11, 95:23, 96:12 texted [1] - 31:13 texting [1] - 25:18 texts [11] - 25:20, 31:14, 31:19, 31:23, 35:3, 35:4, 76:2, 79:24, 80:13, 80:16, **THE** [144] - 1:21, 4:1, 4:2, 4:4, 5:7, 10:5, 11:12, 11:23, 12:11, 12:15, 12:23, 13:2, 13:5, 13:8, 15:1, 15:7, 15:12, 15:17, 15:21, 15:23, 16:9, 16:13, 17:2, 17:6, 17:12, 19:19, 20:20, 20:24, 23:14, 24:24, 27:10, 27:13, 32:8, 32:11, 33:5, 33:10, 33:14, 33:23, 34:5, 34:13, 34:24, 35:2, 35:5, 35:22, 36:3, 36:14, 37:20, 37:24, 38:1, 38:4, 38:11, 38:21, 39:19, 39:25, 40:2, 40:15, 40:20, 43:3, 43:6, 43:12, 45:14, 46:21, 46:24, 47:7, 47:14, 49:13, 49:15, 49:18, 49:20, 50:3, 50:6, 50:9, 50:12, 50:17, 50:20, 51:1, 51:11, 51:18, 51:24, 52:2, 52:6, 52:10, 52:13, 52:16, 52:19, 53:11, 53:19, 54:3, 54:8, 54:10, 54:24, 55:7, 55:22, 56:16, 57:7, 57:9, 57:16, 57:18, 59:3, 59:22, 60:5, 62:13, 63:12, 63:15, 63:18, 64:15, 64:22, 65:3, 65:19, 66:3, 66:6, 66:16, 67:8, 68:3, 68:8, 69:18, 70:2, 71:4, 72:21, 74:25, 78:15, 78:17, 83:18, 83:23, 86:25, 87:3, 87:21, 87:23, 89:16, 90:21, 90:23, 91:21, 92:15, 93:11, 93:14, 100:11, 100:14, 100:19, 101:3, 101:6, 102:4, 102:9, 102:18, 103:16 theory [8] - 10:9, 11:23, 12:11, 12:24, 13:3, 41:18, 66:24, 80:10 Theresa [1] - 4:21 THERESA[1] - 2:6 they've [6] - 34:19, 47:5, 49:9, 65:13, 80:24, 97:12 thinking [1] - 95:4 third [25] - 13:6, 21:21, 32:17, 36:5, 38:16, 38:23, 41:18, 42:12, 42:19, 42:25, 43:2, 44:19, 47:17, 56:6, 56:16, 56:20, 57:13, 58:4, 62:13, 66:21, 68:1, 88:5, 89:19, 89:22, 102:23 third-parties [18] - 32:17, 36:5, 38:16, 38:23, 41:18, 42:12, 42:19, 42:25, 44:19, 47:17, 56:6, 56:16, 56:20, 57:13, 58:4, 68:1, 89:19, 89:22 third-party [4] - 13:6, 43:2, 66:21, 88:5 thirty [4] - 75:8, 75:16, 76:7, 78:1 THOMAS [1] - 2:19 thousands [4] - 21:24, 22:15, 79:24, 81:9 threat [1] - 69:14 threatened [4] - 13:23, 69:8, 69:9, 70:3 threatening [1] - 69:6 three [21] - 5:17, 9:2, 9:3, 16:4, 18:7, 21:23, 22:9, 24:17, 26:2, 27:7, 28:3, 30:3, 31:23, 58:3, 58:7, 68:14, 68:21, 76:21, 94:2, 97:24, 98:18

three-and-a-half [2] - 97:24, 98:18 throats [1] - 33:20 throughout [2] - 22:12, 101:16 throw [1] - 51:9 Thursday [1] - 84:16 ti's [1] - 79:20 tier [1] - 62:14 time-back [1] - 7:7 timing [3] - 36:4, 36:6, 36:9 Tish [1] - 54:22 today [14] - 5:13, 12:6, 15:24, 17:24, 32:12, 36:4, 36:11, 39:22, 57:21, 58:1, 59:16, 64:22, 65:20, 94:14 together [1] - 45:24 took [6] - 5:10, 8:6, 17:16, 20:12, 24:19, 81:21 tooth [1] - 70:12 top [2] - 83:6, 83:11 totality [1] - 32:18 touch [7] - 21:1, 25:1, 25:3, 25:19, 26:7, 34:14, 37:11 touched [1] - 75:15 touching [1] - 38:4 toward [1] - 77:24 trace [1] - 46:2 transcript [7] - 58:9, 62:16, 62:17, 62:22, 62:24, 73:13, 99:5 TRANSCRIPT[1] - 1:20 Transcript [1] - 3:13 Transcription [1] - 3:13 transcripts [2] - 19:17, 87:4 trauma [1] - 34:6 traumatize [1] - 47:19 traumatized [2] - 34:5, 60:23 traumatizing [1] - 73:9 treat [1] - 11:6 treated [3] - 11:15, 14:14, 37:8 treats [1] - 11:13 **TREMONTE**[1] - 2:5 Tremonte [1] - 4:22 trial [8] - 8:7, 29:8, 32:14, 44:17, 53:6, 54:24, 55:1, 77:1 tried [11] - 10:1, 10:2, 16:3, 28:15, 67:6, 77:5, 77:6, 79:10, 79:15, 96:25, 101:16

trolling [1] - 96:4

TROOPER [1] - 1:4

Trooper [75] - 1:24, 4:5, 4:11, 4:13, 6:17, 7:1, 7:3, 7:8, 8:1, 8:3, 8:7, 8:18, 8:19, 8:22, 9:10, 10:14, 11:9, 17:1, 18:4, 19:13, 20:10, 20:12, 20:15, 20:16, 21:1, 21:11, 21:16, 21:19, 21:25, 22:3, 22:7, 22:11, 24:15, 24:17, 34:8, 34:24, 35:7, 35:13, 38:20, 41:8, 41:9, 45:19, 45:23, 46:6, 46:8, 48:15, 61:6, 70:1, 72:10, 72:14, 73:23, 73:24, 74:6, 74:19, 74:20, 75:17, 75:18, 75:20, 77:1, 82:5, 85:9, 85:19, 85:23, 85:24, 86:2, 86:17, 93:23, 93:24, 95:1, 95:8, 98:2

troopers [2] - 21:14, 24:18 true [11] - 15:7, 26:3, 26:12, 28:2, 38:8, 41:13, 50:21, 51:20, 59:22, 67:12, 81.13 truly [2] - 47:15, 98:13 trustworthiness [7] - 53:23, 53:25, 54:13, 54:18, 54:20, 55:3, 55:4 truth [1] - 65:22 **try** [6] - 16:16, 34:12, 44:6, 70:9, 91:10, 97:2 trying [26] - 9:22, 12:7, 12:8, 13:9, 17:20, 22:23, 23:10, 23:12, 23:13, 24:10, 32:1, 37:22, 43:13, 44:10, 46:17, 55:23, 56:2, 60:11, 64:22, 69:22, 71:1, 82:8, 85:4, 85:7, 86:18 TRZASKOMA[2] - 2:6, 4:21 Trzaskoma [5] - 4:22, 17:17, 24:8, 26:22, 52:19 turn [3] - 37:17, 71:1, 100:16 turned [1] - 94:7 turning [1] - 5:11 tweet [7] - 45:25, 46:5, 59:25, 60:7, 103:9, 103:10 tweets [2] - 27:23, 28:18 twice [1] - 28:5 Twitter [1] - 64:7 two [24] - 9:5, 13:15, 13:16, 14:13, 16:4, 19:5, 19:14, 20:11, 21:25, 24:18, 26:2, 27:7, 28:11, 31:23, 40:14, 46:6, 58:6, 74:10, 77:3, 80:23, 88:11, 94:9, 99:6, 101:4 two-and-a-half [1] - 94:9 twofold [1] - 46:4 tying [1] - 7:11

U

types [3] - 25:21, 79:18, 80:14

typically [1] - 54:13

ultimate [1] - 62:4 ultimately [1] - 44:18 unable [1] - 76:5 uncertain [1] - 51:15 unclear [2] - 51:14, 79:25 uncomfortable [1] - 25:9 under [21] - 13:3, 43:18, 46:1, 47:4, 47:23, 48:10, 49:9, 49:18, 49:24, 50:3, 51:3, 51:8, 52:3, 60:9, 67:17, 67:18, 70:23, 70:24, 98:11, 100:6, 100:9 undergoes [1] - 15:3 underlying [1] - 52:24 underproduced [1] - 58:21 understood [5] - 15:22, 16:10, 20:20, 26:9, 38:22 unethical [1] - 29:14 unfair [1] - 8:2 unfortunately [1] - 44:25 UNITED [2] - 1:1, 1:21 United [1] - 1:6 universe [4] - 43:24, 44:13, 53:7, 60:10

unless [3] - 38:9, 40:25, 100:5 unlike [2] - 75:5, 98:20 unreasonably [1] - 34:19 unredacted [9] - 19:22, 58:9, 62:16, 62:17, 73:13, 74:3, 78:4, 87:4, 87:8

untrue [1] - 37:11 up [18] - 16:24, 23:3, 29:12, 31:19, 33:25, 35:8, 37:22, 39:7, 44:2, 49:22, 61:21, 66:4, 69:8, 74:15, 93:9, 99:23, 100:8, 101:11

utility [1] - 11:17 utilized [1] - 85:18

V

VALDI [1] - 1:25 Valdi [1] - 4:10

various [2] - 52:24, 102:25

veracity [1] - 24:4 Verizon [1] - 97:23 versus [2] - 4:5, 4:6

viable [1] - 34:9 **victim** [3] - 11:19, 64:20, 73:21

victim's [1] - 48:2 victimize [1] - 44:10

victims [10] - 7:17, 7:22, 7:25, 8:9, 46:15, 60:22, 62:1, 66:18, 73:21, 74:20

view [6] - 26:5, 62:23, 82:5, 84:2, 98:23, 99:13

Virginia [2] - 78:19, 80:1 **virtually** [1] - 8:16

Vladeck [1] - 37:12

voluminous [2] - 21:13, 66:25

volunteer [1] - 91:9 voted [1] - 88:19

W

W-A-N-G [1] - 57:8 wait [3] - 36:1, 69:4, 89:12 waiting [3] - 36:11, 42:1, 56:7

waiving [1] - 90:1 walk [1] - 66:9 Wall [1] - 25:19

WANG [3] - 57:5, 57:8, 78:18

Wang [2] - 78:17, 95:22

wants [16] - 23:25, 24:1, 29:2, 35:23, 41:25, 42:5, 54:24, 56:2, 61:23, 73:1, 73:11, 73:12, 74:3, 82:2, 91:13, 97:21

Washington [1] - 75:14 watched [1] - 27:4 website [1] - 79:9

week [3] - 27:23, 37:11, 86:22

weekend [1] - 5:19

weeks [6] - 21:4, 21:12, 30:4, 31:19,

31:23, 43:19

welcome [3] - 38:1, 49:5, 62:1

West [2] - 2:2, 2:21

whatsoever [3] - 86:5, 86:17, 86:23

wheel [1] - 102:23

whole [3] - 22:12, 23:11, 71:2

wholly [1] - 8:2

wide [3] - 6:4, 28:13, 44:12

widespread [1] - 6:8

Wigdor [4] - 4:11, 4:13, 103:11, 103:12

WIGDOR [1] - 1:23

willing [13] - 16:13, 18:9, 32:13, 48:7, 58:6, 59:3, 59:13, 62:25, 63:4, 66:9,

67:1, 77:17, 83:6 **wind** [1] - 65:10

window [1] - 51:9 wink [1] - 55:15

wish [1] - 29:4

witness [13] - 16:3, 47:5, 48:21, 53:16, 65:22, 66:21, 69:8, 70:3, 70:12, 77:2,

83:8, 92:14, 102:11

witness' [2] - 9:9, 62:19

witnessed [1] - 69:9

witnesses [22] - 7:14, 13:11, 13:19, 14:15, 14:20, 16:2, 20:2, 33:7, 44:17, 49:8, 53:8, 54:2, 56:11, 56:13, 77:1, 78:8, 78:10, 78:12, 85:25, 88:5, 99:9, 100:24

woman [6] - 11:1, 11:13, 37:8, 55:13, 63:23, 63:24

women [18] - 8:6, 11:6, 11:14, 11:15, 17:1, 19:4, 19:16, 23:20, 24:21, 55:16, 61:11, 75:10, 75:13, 77:3, 77:24, 78:25, 88:17

wonderful [1] - 12:20 wondering [1] - 34:15 word [3] - 13:25, 17:9, 74:11

words [5] - 35:14, 50:25, 76:2, 76:8, 95:15

workable [1] - 15:3

workplace [6] - 61:6, 72:12, 75:8, 88:18, 88:20. 88:21

works [4] - 11:1, 11:2, 11:3, 11:10 world [7] - 27:3, 27:22, 27:23, 28:23,

29:24, 42:22, 49:2 **worried** [1] - 63:7

worthless [1] - 39:8 writes [1] - 31:23

writing [1] - 97:25

written [2] - 79:2, 88:23 wrote [3] - 76:19, 97:5, 97:6

Υ

year [2] - 13:22, 93:21

years [10] - 19:5, 27:4, 74:14, 75:8, 75:16, 78:1, 94:2, 94:9, 97:24, 98:18

yell [2] - 59:5, 88:12 yelled [2] - 30:6, 85:6

YORK [2] - 1:1, 1:8 York [28] - 1:6, 1:24, 2:2, 2:6, 2:8, 2:9, 2:12, 2:15, 2:18, 2:21, 2:24, 3:3, 3:6, 3:11, 4:5, 5:5, 10:16, 43:7, 45:1, 45:9

yourself [2] - 17:16, 23:22

yourselves [1] - 91:19

Ζ

zealous [2] - 47:11

zealously [2] - 34:12, 47:8

 $\textbf{Zemsky}\, {\scriptscriptstyle [6]} \textbf{-} 28.7,\, 68.22,\, 68.23,\, 69.3,\,$

69:14, 69:25 **ZOE** [1] - 3:4 **Zoe** [1] - 57:14

Zoom [3] - 82:24, 83:7, 83:8